
Subject: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 08:31:32 GMT

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

Hi Guys, Some thoughts:

Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has no pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??

I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699) & Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield pro results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other than Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..

My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that served the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary. AND That's the point..

Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that native's are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even more, it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your native system up to Pro standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to an PT HD system.

There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??

Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:

-The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer. This would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their SX-1 was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..

I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..

As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW, we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)

I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on [www.gearslutz.com](#) about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters.. I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up

a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they sink another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound.. So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it that Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is , PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..

Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were them, I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.

Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your current offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say 3-15k would do it..

Okay end of rant..LaMont

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 08:55:16 GMT

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

I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs are so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting faster?

The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP). There's no real cure for that. :^)

It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five year wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.

Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into more laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market. The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go with Intel, pick your best time for the transition.

If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of PPC choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which has more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue to work after the Intel transition.

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

LaMont wrote:

> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:

>

> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has no
> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??

>

> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699) &
> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield pro
> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other than
> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..

>

> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that served
> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.
> AND That's the point..

>

> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
> other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that native's
> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even more,
> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your native system up to Pro
> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to an
> PT HD system.

> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??

>

> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:

> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer. This
> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their SX-1
> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..

> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..

>

> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW,
> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I
> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)

>

>

> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearsnutz.com

> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up
> a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original
> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they sink
> another 5-10k in analogue summing gear, they will have that magic sound..
> So, I'm thinking, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it that
> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry, that they can dictate just
> how much cool stuff reaches the lower end of the spectrum. What I mean is ,
> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>
>
> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUs, little software
> support. do they really think that this was good move now?? I'm not even
> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAC lovers and users. If I were them,
> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..) Sorry.
>
> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of
> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your current
> offering, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say 3-15k
> would do it..
> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Michele Hobbs](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 09:08:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi LaMont,

I've wondered about this, too. It seems that any company that has tried this has failed to some extent, either in marketing the product or bringing it to full capability (um, I think Emu-soniq failed on both accounts). I'm scraping my brain to recall other efforts (Creamware? Soundscape? One other that I can't remember).

I really liked the Paris concept...it was like working with a tape deck with the capability of editing on a computer...probably one of the only low-latency monitoring software solutions, and with a controller to boot! Too bad that it wasn't developed further...could you imagine Paris with mixers beyond 16 tracks, surround sound capability, automation of everything, VST2/AU plug-in support, better file management and midi capability like Logic, DP or Cubase? Wow!!

OTOH, I think we have it pretty good with these fast Macs/PC's. Powercores and UAD cards are pretty nice, too.

I really don't see the Apple situation as a fiasco as much as it is

business as usual. Seems like Apple is always releasing something that developers need time to react to (Can you say Audio Units? What..no more floppy drives?). I'll just do what I've always done...sit back, wait and enjoy the system that I have now.

-Michele Hobbs

LaMont wrote:

> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:

>

> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has no
> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??

>

> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699) &
> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield pro
> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other than
> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..

>

> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that served
> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.
> AND That's the point..

>

> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
> other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that native's
> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even more,
> it's a known fact that, if you wew to build your native system up to Pro
> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to an
> PT HD system.

> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??

>

> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:

> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer. This
> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their SX-1
> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..

> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..

>

> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW,
> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I
> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)

>

>
> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearsutz.com
> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up
> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orginal
> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they sink
> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it that
> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is ,
> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>
>
> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were them,
> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...:) Sorry.
>
> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of
> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your current
> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say 3-15k
> would do it..
> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>

Subject: Re: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 09:11:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What about Creamware?

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:43c9fa54\$1@linux...

>
> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>
> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has no
> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>
> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699) &
> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield pro
> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other
> than
> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
> Soundscape..
>
> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that

served

> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.

> AND That's the point..

>

> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that native's

> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even more,

> it's a known fact that, if you were to build your native system up to Pro

> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to an

> PT HD system.

> There has to be a manufacturer that will stand up and fill in the gap between

> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??

>

> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:

> -The Mackie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability

> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found

> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities

> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.

This

> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their SX-1

> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product

> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..

> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a very cool

> DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..

>

> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW,
> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster

> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I

> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again...)

>

>

> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearsutz.com

> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..

> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up

> a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original

> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they

sink

> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, they will have that magic sound..

> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it

that

- > Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry, that they can dictate just
- > how much cool stuff reaches the lower end of the spectrum. What I mean is ,
- > PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
- >
- >
- > Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUs, little software
- > support. do they really think that this was a good move now?? I'm not even
- > a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAC lovers and users. If I were them,
- > I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...:) Sorry.
- >
- > Again, calling on all new and current manufacturers..You have a vast market of
- > Pro users and studios that need more juice and pro features than your current
- > offerings, but we don't want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
- 3-15k
- > would do it..
- > Okay end of rant..LaMont
- >

Subject: Re: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Bill Lorentzen](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 15:06:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Lamont,

I think you hit it when you mentioned the Mackie or Yamaha integrated system possibilities. Both these companies have the muscle to do big things. The 01X seems like the first step in that direction. And the DBX is way cool with the UAD cards, but much pricier. WE should expect not a hardware based DAW, but an integrated hard/software solution. That leaves room for expansion and upgrades.

Too bad Samplitude (Magix) can't play with these big boys.

On the other hand if you become one of the analog summing converts, then it all reverts back to the good old days with a mixer. Back in the '90s I bought a 16 channel API mixer for \$11,000 and parted it out, because noone wanted a mixer that size. I would love to have that now. It would be the perfect DAW mixer.

Bill

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:43c9fa54\$1@linux...

>
> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>
> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has no
> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>
> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699) &
> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield pro
> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other
> than
> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
> Soundscape..
>
> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
> served
> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
> revolutionary.
> AND That's the point..
>
> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
> other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that
> native's
> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
> more,
> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your native system up to Pro
> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to an
> PT HD system.
> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap
> between
> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??
>
> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
> capability
> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
> This
> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
> SX-1
> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>
> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW,
> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer

> faster
> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
> already..I
> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
> again...)
>
>
> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up
> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orignal
> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
> sink
> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
> that
> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is ,
> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>
>
> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
> software
> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
> them,
> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..) Sorry.
>
> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of
> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
> current
> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
> 3-15k
> would do it..
> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 17:03:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A curiosity question - why do you not consider Nuendo, Logic etc, "pro DAWs"? Let's look back a bit - DAWs of any nature weren't considered "pro" when first offering an alternative to tape and a \$500,000 console. Technology advances, ProTools becomes more and more popular, and the name sticks - it's now "pro". Then Paris, which was not considered pro when Ensoniq first launched it, caught on in a small community and by Paris

users, it is considered "pro". Just a semantics question perhaps, but it does make me wonder if each market that finds the tool they like, considers it "pro" because it works for them. I know of no standard to define the term outside of what that tool does for one's income.

Anyway, other dedicated dsp systems: Pyramix (www.merging.com). Soundscape - still popular in Europe I believe (<http://www.sydec.be/>).

I think as others are pointing out, the cost and risk of developing dedicated dsp is the real issue - faster computers are making the concept obsolete to a large market of users, at least for the most part.

In the video world, streaming full resolution, uncompressed HD video still requires dedicated processing for high speed work (Blackmagic, Canopus, Avid cards, etc), and production houses that require full realtime effects require it (render times not acceptable - e.g. Broadcast, networks where deadlines are very tight, large commercial production houses, etc - many use high end \$100k+ systems for that, with no more effects or editing capability than Final Cut Pro, Vegas or Avid Express, but eliminating render times).

However, even that market is changing, granted from the small production house up, not yet in the broadcast world. The limitations of native there are how well a native system can support full resolution high quality video (cpu/disk load, speed, etc), not the actual editing software's functionality or "professional" image. So in audio, if one can stream 100 tracks of audio with full, quality processing and effects, including outboard (more than I could do with my Paris rig), and it earns 100% of one's income, is that not "pro"? It's more than I was doing in studios with 2" tape and only 24 tracks to work with. :-)

Committing to dedicated DSP is costly and very likely (these days) a short term investment - that's why no one has jumped in to do it. Mark my words, Digidesign is building their native holdings for a reason. Eventually they too will be offering a dual/quad quad core native system with 64-bit processing and as much power as and HD3 rig. They've already made an old technology (motorola dsp) hang on for years after it has been superceded by better dsp solutions (custom asic, or even video graphics chips - UAD, and whatever the new generic dsp system is - can't recall the name).

Just my .02

Regards,
Dedric

On 1/15/06 1:31 AM, in article 43c9fa54\$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>
> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has no
> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>
> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699) &
> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield pro
> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other than
> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>
> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that served
> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
> revolutionary.
> AND That's the point..
>
> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that naitive's
> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even more,
> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to Pro
> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to an
> PT HD system.
> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>
> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer. This
> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their SX-1
> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>
> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW,
> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
> already..I
> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)
>
>
> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up
> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orginal
> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they sink

> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, they will have that magic sound..
> So, I'm thinking, 'Why have we gone backwards in this DAW game?? Is it that
> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry, that they can dictate just
> how much cool stuff reaches the lower end of the spectrum. What I mean is ,
> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>
>
> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUs, little software
> support. do they really think that this was good move now?? I'm not even
> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAC lovers and users. If I were them,
> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...) Sorry.
>
> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of
> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your current
> offering, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say 3-15k
> would do it..
> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>

Subject: Re: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 17:55:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey DJ,

Creamware? well, nearly bankrupted, and it not widely seen and used in mass quantities. They(creamware) is doing more OEM support in other units these days..

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

>What about Creamware?

>

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:43c9fa54\$1@linux...

>>

>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:

>>

>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
no

>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??

>>

>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)

&

>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield pro

>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other

>than

>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years

>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about

>Soundscape..
>>
>> My Point in this post is to bring to light that Paris was a product that
>served
>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
>revolutionary.
>> AND That's the point..
>>
>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>> other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that
>native's
>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>more,
>> it's a known fact that, if you were to build your native system up to
Pro
>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
an
>> PT HD system.
>> There has to be a manufacturer that will stand up and fill in the gap
>between
>> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??
>>
>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>> -The MACKie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
>capability
>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>This
>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
>SX-1
>> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a very cool
>> DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>
>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
DAW,
>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
>faster
>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>already..I
>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>again..:)
>>
>>
>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..

>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up
>> a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original
>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
>sink
>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, they will have that magic sound..
>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
>that
>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is
,
>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>>
>>
>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
>software
>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAC lovers and users. If I were
>them,
>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...:) Sorry.
>>
>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>of
>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
>current
>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
>3-15k
>> would do it..
>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 18:08:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Jaimie,

Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2) very
expensive.. think about it..??

At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the native cpu
is a secondary issue. Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
enviorment.. The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native users

are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average converters..All to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person does not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they could've gotten with a dsp based DAW.

Having used nuendo since its inception (2000,),logic audio, I can with hesitation, that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and truth be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be desired..

Take care,
Lamont
take care

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs are

>so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>faster?

>
>The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money
>on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>There's no real cure for that. :^)

>
>It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five year

>wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.

>
>Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into more

>laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go with
>Intel, pick your best time for the transition.

>
>If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of PPC
>choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which has
>more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>to work after the Intel transition.

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

>
>
>LaMont wrote:

>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:

>>
>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
no
>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>
>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
&
>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield pro
>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other
than
>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>>
>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
served
>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.
>> AND That's the point..
>>
>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that naitive's
>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
more,
>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to
Pro
>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
an
>> PT HD system.
>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>
>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
This
>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
SX-1
>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>
>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
DAW,
>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I
>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)

>>
>>
>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
up
>> a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original
>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
sink
>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
that
>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is
,
>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>>
>>
>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
them,
>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...:) Sorry.
>>
>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
of
>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
current
>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
3-15k
>> would do it..
>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 18:12:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lamont wrote:
> Hey Jaimie,
>
> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2) very
> expensive.. think about it..??

Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end a

Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and an inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.

Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this discussion).

There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for computer-based systems.

Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of the advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems. PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.

I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along the way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and it was a noticeable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.

PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close, but forever short. So I sold it.

Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP for the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system. The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty much covered it.

I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid system.

After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software and i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.

If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM and HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years. Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under 10K. Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may vary.

My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need to upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with slowing me down.

However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra cost.

> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the native cpu
> is a secondary issue.

With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited DSP system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years, the cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying a newer, faster computer.

And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development, whatever else you do), in one shot.

Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
> environment..

This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through Logic the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.

The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software. If I need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.

I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can get moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part of the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to the precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.

The sad truth with most if not all native solutions is that

- > it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, in which native users
- > are going back to purchase, talk back units, better than average converters..All
- > to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person does
- > not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they could've
- > gotten with a dsp based DAW.

A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers to choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes under, your system will not hit a dead end.

Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.

- > Having used Nuendo since its inception (2000,), Logic Audio, I can with hesitation,
- > that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and truth
- > be known, Steinberg's way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be desired..

A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving fader controller and you're well under 10K.

It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.

OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKruz.com>

> Take care,

> Lamont

> take care

>

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

>

>>I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs are

>

>

>>so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting

>>faster?
>>
>>The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money
>>on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>
>>It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five year
>
>
>>wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>>choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>>starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.
>>
>>Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into more
>
>
>>laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go with
>>Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>
>>If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of PPC
>>choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which has
>>more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>to work after the Intel transition.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>
>>
>>LaMont wrote:
>>
>>>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>
>>>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
>
> no
>
>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>
>>>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>
> &
>
>>>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield pro
>>>results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other
>
> than

>
>>>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>>>
>>>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
>
> served
>
>>>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.
>>> AND That's the point..
>>>
>>>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>>>other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that naitive's
>>>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>
> more,
>
>>>it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to
>
> Pro
>
>>>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
>
> an
>
>>>PT HD system.
>>>There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
>>>PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>
>>>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>-The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
>>>to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
>>>in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>
> This
>
>>>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
>
> SX-1
>
>>>was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>>>first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
>>>DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>
>>>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
>

> DAW,
>
>>>we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
>>>Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I
>>>say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..:)
>>>
>>>
>>>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>
> up
>
>>>a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original
>>>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
>
> sink
>
>>>another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>>>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
>
> that
>
>>>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>>>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is
>
> ,
>
>>>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>>>
>>>
>>>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
>>>support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
>>>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAC lovers and users. If I were
>
> them,
>
>>>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
>>>
>>>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>
> of
>
>>>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
>
> current
>
>>>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say

>
> 3-15k
>
>>>would do it..
>>>Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 18:22:07 GMT

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

Hey Dedic,

The reason I dont consider nuendo/sx as pro is beacause, it's only software..To get that and any native base app to pro standards in a day/out studio situation will cost you: Control surface unit, good converters, monitoring/talk back unit, and lets not forget the blazing cpu thatsd needed for low-latency, big toime plugins..

I'm not saying, that pro can't use natives, we do..It;s just like BrianT's nuendo system(s)..He manning his nuendo systems using theEuphonics system 5 system..can we say, that will and does take his system to a new level?? But, we all know, thtats what BT demands from a system.. mt point in the post was not ask a question "where is the development for the 5-10k crowd?? Sure digi is covering the high end, with their new mixer controllers both offering great monitoring ,talkback, and tight software integration..I ca'nt believe that in the year 2006, no manufacture can com out with a cheaper solution than digi??... takecare..
lamont

dric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>A curiosity question - why do you not consider Nuendo, Logic etc, "pro
>DAWs"? Let's look back a bit - DAWs of any nature weren't considered "pro"
>when first offering an alternative to tape and a \$500,000 console.
>Technology advances, ProTools becomes more and more popular, and the name
>sticks - it's now "pro". Then Paris, which was not considered pro when
>Ensoniq first launched it, caught on in a small community and by Paris
>users, it is considered "pro". Just a semantics question perhaps, but it
>does make me wonder if each market that finds the tool they like, considers
>it "pro" because it works for them. I know of no standard to define the
>term outside of what that tool does for one's income.

>
>Anyway, other dedicated dsp systems: Pyramix (www.merging.com). Soundscape
>- still popular in Europe I believe (<http://www.sydec.be/>).
>
>I think as others are pointing out, the cost and risk of developing
>dedicated dsp is the real issue - faster computers are making the concept
>obsolete to a large market of users, at least for the most part.
>
>In the video world, streaming full resolution, uncompressed HD video still
>requires dedicated processing for high speed work (Blackmagic, Canopus,
Avid
>cards, etc), and production houses that require full realtime effects
>require it (render times not acceptable - e.g. Broadcast, networks where
>deadlines are very tight, large commercial production houses, etc - many
use
>high end \$100k+ systems for that, with no more effects or editing capability
>than Final Cut Pro, Vegas or Avid Express, but eliminating render times).
>
>However, even that market is changing, granted from the small production
>house up, not yet in the broadcast world. The limitations of native there
>are how well a native system can support full resolution high quality video
>(cpu/disk load, speed, etc), not the actual editing software's functionality
>or "professional" image. So in audio, if one can stream 100 tracks of audio
>with full, quality processing and effects, including outboard (more than
I
>could do with my Paris rig), and it earns 100% of one's income, is that
not
>"pro"? It's more than I was doing in studios with 2" tape and only 24
>tracks to work with. :-)
>
>Committing to dedicated DSP is costly and very likely (these days) a short
>term investment - that's why no one has jumped in to do it. Mark my words,
>Digidesign is building their native holdings for a reason. Eventually they
>too will be offering a dual/quad quad core native system with 64-bit
>processing and as much power as and HD3 rig. They've already made an old
>technology (motorola dsp) hang on for years after it has been superceded
by
>better dsp solutions (custom asic, or even video graphics chips - UAD, and
>whatever the new generic dsp system is - can't recall the name).
>
>Just my .02
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>On 1/15/06 1:31 AM, in article 43c9fa54\$1@linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>

>>
>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>
>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
no
>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>
>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
&
>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield pro
>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other
than
>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>>
>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
served
>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
>> revolutionary.
>> AND That's the point..
>>
>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>> other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that native's
>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
more,
>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your native system up to
Pro
>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
an
>> PT HD system.
>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
>> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??
>>
>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
This
>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
SX-1
>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>
>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
DAW,

>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>> already..I
>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..:)
>>
>>
>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearsultz.com
>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
up
>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orignal
>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
sink
>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
that
>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is
,
>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>>
>>
>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAC lovers and users. If I were
them,
>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
>>
>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
of
>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
current
>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
3-15k
>> would do it..
>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 19:34:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need what
I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this discussion)."

Agreed.. :)

But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies of mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so ago. They are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consensus for us all is that we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the non-computer music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology, that they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out having to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "treadmill" if you will. I've been on that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working system setups I've destroyed due because I was trying to play the CPU sped game. I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems were not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and OS.. I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9 that's rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable stable stable:)

2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s to Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces due to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our conversations about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT Radar with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a solid working system, that you do not have to make excuses to yourself and the client..

Dedric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated dsp system maybe a daunting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China (Phonic firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
LaMont

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>Lamont wrote:
>> Hey Jaimie,
>>
>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
very
>> expensive.. think about it..??
>
>Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end a
>Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and an
>inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.
>
>Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need

>(what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this

>discussion).

>

>There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're

>available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>computer-based systems.

>

>Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of the

>advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.

>PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.

>

>I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along the

>way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and it
>was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just
>as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.

>

>PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
>freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,

>but forever short. So I sold it.

>

>Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP for

>the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.

>The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>much covered it.

>

>I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition

>to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid system.

>

>After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software and

>i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>
>If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM and
>HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some third

>party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under 10K.

>Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may vary.
>
>My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need to
>upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
>slowing me down.
>
>However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
>production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra cost.
>
>
>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the native
cpu
>> is a secondary issue.
>
>With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited DSP

>system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years, the

>cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying

>a newer, faster computer.
>
>And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>whatever else you do), in one shot.
>
>
>Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>> environment..
>
>This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through Logic

>the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.

>
>The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software. If I

>need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>
>I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can get
>moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part of

>the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to the

>precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>
>
>The sad truth with most if not all native solutions is that
>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, in which native users
>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average converters..All
>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
does
>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they could've
>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>
>A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers to
>choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
>under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>
>Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>
>
>> Having used Nuendo since its inception (2000,), Logic Audio, I can with
hesitation,
>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and truth
>> be known, Steinberg's way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be desired..
>
>A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
>Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving

>fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>
>It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really

>saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>
>OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long

>enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>
>
>
>
>> Take care,
>> Lamont
>> take care
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>>I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs are
>>
>>
>>>so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting

>>>faster?
>>>
>>>The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money

>>>on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>>There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>
>>>It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five year
>>
>>
>>>wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>>>choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably

>>>starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.
>>>
>>>Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into more
>>
>>
>>>laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.

>>>The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go with

>>>Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>
>>>If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of PPC

>>>choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which has

>>>more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue

>>>to work after the Intel transition.

>>>

>>>Cheers,

>>> -Jamie

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

>>>

>>>

>>>LaMont wrote:

>>>

>>>>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:

>>>>

>>>>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has

>>

>> no

>>

>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??

>>>>

>>>>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)

>>

>> &

>>

>>>>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield

pro

>>>>results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other

>>

>> than

>>

>>>>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years

>>>>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..

>>>>

>>>>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that

>>

>> served

>>

>>>>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.

>>>> AND That's the point..

>>>>

>>>>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only

>>>>other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that

naitive's

>>>>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even

>>

>> more,

>>

>>>>it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to

>>
>> Pro
>>
>>>>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
>>
>> an
>>
>>>>PT HD system.
>>>>There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap
between
>>>>PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>
>>>>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>-The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
>>>>to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
>>>>in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>>to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>>
>> This
>>
>>>>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
>>
>> SX-1
>>
>>>>was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>>>>first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
>>>>DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>
>>>>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
>>
>> DAW,
>>
>>>>we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
faster
>>>>Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
already..I
>>>>say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>>about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>>I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>
>> up
>>
>>>>a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original
>>>>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they

>>
>> sink
>>
>>>>another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>>>>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
>>
>> that
>>
>>>>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>>>>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
is
>>
>> ,
>>
>>>>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for
HD..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
>>>>support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not
even
>>>>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
>>
>> them,
>>
>>>>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
>>>>
>>>>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
>>
>> current
>>
>>>>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
>>
>> 3-15k
>>
>>>>would do it..
>>>>Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>
>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW

Posted by [Chris Wargo](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 20:03:13 GMT

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

"Lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2) very
>expensive.. think about it..??

But you don't have to play it. Do you change the way you work every two years, or does the perceived need change? Did you need 64 tracks of audio last year and all of a sudden need 96 tracks? Is the new uberhog reverb really that much better that you need a new computer every two years?

I used to be caught up in the speed race myself. Upgrading from a 800 MHz processor, to a 900, to a 1200, etc. It all seems pretty silly now. I stopped at an Athlon XP1400+ and life has been sweet ever since. I get the 24 tracks of 24/44.1 audio and 7-8 plugs that I need. My computer hasn't crashed in over 3 years. When I was running Paris, I had problems on a daily basis. Life has been productive and sweet since going native.

-Chris

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 20:48:31 GMT

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

LaMont wrote:

> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need what
> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this discussion)."
>
> Agreed.. :)
> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points.

Not really. I think we agree about a few things but when it comes to drawing an overall conclusion about the value of native systems, it looks like we disagree. Based on our different needs and experiences.

All the systems I moved on from did NOT cover everything I need, including PARIS; another card-based system for which I wrote the documentation; and tape-based systems before that.

The native system I have now is the closest yet to meeting my needs, and even exceeding them in some areas. Although I'd still appreciate a few bug fixes. There's also room for GUI improvements as always. That could also be said about DSP systems, though.

Bottom line, CPU speed is NOT holding this system back. I don't need to buy a faster computer. Although if I should decide to buy a faster computer to meet the needs of another application, that would also give me free extra power for my DAW - a synergy not available in a DSP-locked system.

I AM encouraged that upgrades come periodically, third party options are available and the system is developed and supported. These are pluses, not minuses.

There are sometimes hiccups from having multiple developers involved, a bug in one product could possibly affect another - so it pays to do research before deciding what to use and actually communicate with developers. If your needs lie on the bleeding edge, then some amount of R&D is necessary to find out for yourself what will work and what won't, and reporting bugs can help get them fixed.

I think we agree that it's important to know the tools. It does take time and care whether you're using a 2" tape machine, a DSP system or a native system. Know what you want, know your tools, do the maintenance, have a backup system.

Or just rent time at someone else's studio and focus only on playing. :^)

In general admin on a Mac is pretty simple and largely automated. BTW, I did not find Win95/98 to be a particularly stable computing experience. Or OS9, for that matter. Glad those days are gone. YMMV.

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

> Some Producer buddies of
> mine in town, were having this same discussion about a month or so ago. They
> are all Mac users, with a few giga machines. The consensus for us all is that
> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the non-computer
> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology, that
> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed
> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best without having
> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "treadmill" if you will. I've been on
> that treadmill since '97, and as I look back on how many great working system
> setups I've destroyed due because I was trying to play the CPU speed game.
> I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems were
> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster CPU and OS..
> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9 that's
> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setups still has Win 98se..Stable stable
> stable:)

>
> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s to
> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces due
> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our conversations
> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT Radar
> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a solid working
> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the client..
>
> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated dsp system
> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China (Phonic
> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
> LaMont
>
>
>
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>>Lamont wrote:
>>
>>>Hey Jaimie,
>>>
>>>Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>>>Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>
> very
>
>>>expensive.. think about it..??
>>
>>Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end a
>>Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and an
>>inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.
>>
>>Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>(what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>
>
>>discussion).
>>
>>There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>
>
>>available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't

>>particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>computer-based systems.
>>
>>Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of the
>
>
>>advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>
>
>>PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>
>>I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along the
>
>
>>way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and it
>>was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just
>>as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>
>>PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
>>freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,
>
>
>>but forever short. So I sold it.
>>
>>Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP for
>
>
>>the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>
>
>>The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>>much covered it.
>>
>>I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>
>
>>to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid system.
>>
>>After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software and
>
>
>>i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the

>>upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>
>>If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM and
>>HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some third
>
>
>>party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under 10K.
>
>
>>Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may vary.
>>
>>My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need to
>>upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
>>slowing me down.
>>
>>However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
>>production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra cost.
>>
>>
>>
>>>At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the native
>
> cpu
>
>>>is a secondary issue.
>>
>>With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited DSP
>
>
>>system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years, the
>
>
>>cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
>
>
>>a newer, faster computer.
>>
>>And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>
>>
>>Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro

>>
>>>enviorment..
>>
>>This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through Logic
>
>
>>the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>
>>The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software. If I
>
>
>>need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>
>>I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can get
>>moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part of
>
>
>>the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to the
>
>
>>precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>
>>
>>The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>
>>>it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native users
>>>are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average converters..All
>>>to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
>
> does
>
>>>not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they could've
>>>gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>
>>A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers to
>>choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
>>under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>
>>Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>
>>
>>
>>>Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, lcan with

>
> hesitation,
>
>>>that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and truth
>>>be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be desired..
>>
>>A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
>>Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving
>
>
>>fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>
>>It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really
>
>
>>saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>
>>OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>>with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>>Take care,
>>>Lamont
>>>take care
>>>
>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs are
>>>
>>>
>>>>so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>
>
>>>>faster?
>>>>
>>>>The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money
>
>

>>>>on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>>>There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>
>>>>It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five year
>>>
>>>
>>>>wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>>>>choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>
>
>>>>starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.
>>>>
>>>>Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into more
>>>
>>>
>>>>laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>
>
>>>>The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go with
>
>
>>>>Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>
>>>>If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of PPC
>
>
>>>>choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which has
>
>
>>>>more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>
>
>>>>to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>>-Jamie
>>>><http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>
>>>>>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
>>>
>>>no
>>>

>>>
>>>>>pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>
>>>>>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>>>
>>>&
>>>
>>>>>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield
>
> pro
>
>>>>>results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other
>>>
>>>than
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>>>>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>>>>>
>>>>>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
>>>
>>>served
>>>
>>>
>>>>>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.
>>>>>AND That's the point..
>>>>>
>>>>>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>>>>>other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that
>
> naitive's
>
>>>>>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>>>
>>>more,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to
>>>
>>>Pro
>>>
>>>
>>>>>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
>>>
>>>an
>>>
>>>
>>>>>PT HD system.

>>>>>There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap
>
> between
>
>>>>>PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>
>>>>>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>-The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
>>>>>to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
>>>>>in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>>>to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>>>
>>> This
>>>
>>>
>>>>>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
>>>
>>>SX-1
>>>
>>>
>>>>>was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>>>>>first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
>>>>>DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>
>>>>>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
>>>
>>>DAW,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
>
> faster
>
>>>>>Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>
> already..I
>
>>>>>say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again...)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>>>I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>
>>>up
>>>
>>>

>>>>a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original
>>>>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
>>>
>>>sink
>>>
>>>
>>>>another 5-10k in analogue summing gear, they will have that magic sound..
>>>>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
>>>
>>>that
>>>
>>>
>>>>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>>>>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
>
> is
>
>>>,
>>>
>>>
>>>>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for
>
> HD..
>
>>>>
>>>>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
>>>>support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not
>
> even
>
>>>>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
>>>
>>>them,
>>>
>>>
>>>>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...:) Sorry.
>>>>
>>>>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>
>>>>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
>>>
>>>current
>>>
>>>
>>>>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say

>>>
>>>3-15k
>>>
>>>
>>>>would do it..
>>>>Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 21:18:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Lamont,

> The reason I dont consider nuendo/sx as pro is beacause, it's only
> software..

That in fact proves my point - "pro" has become much more of a personal perception driven by marketing and peer pressure than the actual definition. For example in another industry, to some video houses, a \$50,000 Avid rig may not be pro compared to a \$200,000 Quantel system, but both will do much the same thing - deliver professional results - with differences that may be key for the specific user (broadcast vs. post, etc), but not the definition of "pro" in general.

Saying software isn't "pro" is missing the point of being a pro. Pro is about getting paid for what you do because you deliver quality results and products that someone else is willing to pay for. In another post you said that Chinese products offer an astounding value for the money. To me that's a rather astounding paradox to your definition. They are a good cost/performance ratio, but it is contradictory to say that Nuendo isn't pro and a C1 mic is, in the same breath. I haven't heard a Chinese mic that compared to what I would consider, and choose as a "pro" mic (whether higher end "pro" from Lawson, Blue or Neumann, or a mid-grade Audio Technica).

Yes, it takes converters, etc, to augment Nuendo for use in various situations, but the same is true of ProTools (ProTools isn't much good without an I/O box). Just because Digi sells it as one package doesn't make it pro. And you have an expensive upgrade path - much more than upgrade PCs every couple of years. I've done the math on this many times (including comparing UAD-1 cards to the TDM equivalents in terms of plugin counts per dollar - UAD-1 cards win easily).

I use my Nuendo rig and many other software, and hardware tools day in and

day out producing media for a variety of professional clients in a very professional setting. We have office/studio space in the world headquarters for one of our main clients. Should I tell them that since I don't have ProTools and a Euphonix or Neve console (yet) to make it look bigger and costs them more than it needs to does that make us less pro? No. Attitude and quality product delivery are what make us pro. Maybe Nuendo doesn't work for you, aor maybe you haven't decided to make it work for you, but it does work for a lot of other "professionals" like myself.

Manufacturers and marketing departments define the line between Pro and Consumer when they add one feature or part that costs more than they believe they can sell to the average consumer, so they almost haphazardly label it "Pro" and double the price. We then blindly adopt that as the "pro" standard and thumb our noses at consumer gear.

It really irritates me when people arrogantly define pro as what they, or someone else has based on how expensive (e.g. Over a randomly chosen pricepoint) and popular it is, and non-pro as anything that isn't all of the above. That just isn't fair, objective, or pro in my book.

It is sad that the media and arts production industry has increasingly come to define the word "pro" by how much it costs to buy rather than the quality of the product. Anyone ever see "Gigli" or heard of Britney Spears? I rest my case. ;-)

Regards,
Dedric
Echo Media Group, LLC

On 1/15/06 11:22 AM, in article 43ca84bf\$1@linux, "Lamont"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> Hey Dedric,
>
> The reason I dont consider nuendo/sx as pro is beacause, it's only
> software..To
> get that and any native base app to pro standards in a day/out studio
> situation
> will cost you: Control surface unit, good converters, monitoring/talk back
> unit, and lets not forget the blazing cpu thatsd needed for low-latency,
> big toime plugins..
>
> I'm not saying, that pro can't use natives, we do..It;s just like BrianT's
> nuendo system(s)..He manning his nuendo systems using theEuphonics system
> 5 system..can we say, that will and does take his system to a new level??
> But, we all know, thtats what BT demands from a system..
> mt point in the post was not ask a question "where is the development for

> the 5-10k crowd?? Sure digi is covering the high end, with their new mixer
> controllers both offering great monitoring ,talkback, and tight software
> integration..I ca'nt believe that in the year 2006, no manufacture can com
> out with a cheaper solution than digi??...
> takecare..
> lamont
>
>
>
>
> dric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> A curiosity question - why do you not consider Nuendo, Logic etc, "pro
>> DAWs"? Let's look back a bit - DAWs of any nature weren't considered "pro"
>> when first offering an alternative to tape and a \$500,000 console.
>> Technology advances, ProTools becomes more and more popular, and the name
>> sticks - it's now "pro". Then Paris, which was not considered pro when
>> Ensoniq first launched it, caught on in a small community and by Paris
>> users, it is considered "pro". Just a semantics question perhaps, but it
>> does make me wonder if each market that finds the tool they like, considers
>> it "pro" because it works for them. I know of no standard to define the
>> term outside of what that tool does for one's income.
>>
>> Anyway, other dedicated dsp systems: Pyramix (www.merging.com). Soundscape
>> - still popular in Europe I believe (<http://www.sydec.be/>).
>>
>> I think as others are pointing out, the cost and risk of developing
>> dedicated dsp is the real issue - faster computers are making the concept
>> obsolete to a large market of users, at least for the most part.
>>
>> In the video world, streaming full resolution, uncompressed HD video still
>> requires dedicated processing for high speed work (Blackmagic, Canopus,
> Avid
>> cards, etc), and production houses that require full realtime effects
>> require it (render times not acceptable - e.g. Broadcast, networks where
>> deadlines are very tight, large commercial production houses, etc - many
> use
>> high end \$100k+ systems for that, with no more effects or editing capability
>> than Final Cut Pro, Vegas or Avid Express, but eliminating render times).
>>
>> However, even that market is changing, granted from the small production
>> house up, not yet in the broadcast world. The limitations of native there
>> are how well a native system can support full resolution high quality video
>> (cpu/disk load, speed, etc), not the actual editing software's functionality
>> or "professional" image. So in audio, if one can stream 100 tracks of audio
>> with full, quality processing and effects, including outboard (more than
> I
>> could do with my Paris rig), and it earns 100% of one's income, is that
> not

>> "pro"? It's more than I was doing in studios with 2" tape and only 24
>> tracks to work with. :-)
>>
>> Committing to dedicated DSP is costly and very likely (these days) a short
>> term investment - that's why no one has jumped in to do it. Mark my words,
>> Digidesign is building their native holdings for a reason. Eventually they
>> too will be offering a dual/quad quad core native system with 64-bit
>> processing and as much power as and HD3 rig. They've already made an old
>> technology (motorola dsp) hang on for years after it has been superceded
> by
>> better dsp solutions (custom asic, or even video graphics chips - UAD, and
>> whatever the new generic dsp system is - can't recall the name).
>>
>> Just my .02
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 1/15/06 1:31 AM, in article 43c9fa54\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>
>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
> no
>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>
>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
> &
>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield pro
>>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other
> than
>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>>>
>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
> served
>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
>>> revolutionary.
>>> AND That's the point..
>>>
>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that
>>> naitive's
>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
> more,
>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to

> Pro
 >>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
 > an
 >>> PT HD system.
 >>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
 >>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
 >>>
 >>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
 >>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
 >>> capability
 >>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
 >>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
 >>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
 > This
 >>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
 > SX-1
 >>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
 >>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
 >>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
 >>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
 >>>
 >>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
 > DAW,
 >>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
 >>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
 >>> already..I
 >>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..:)
 >>>
 >>>
 >>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
 >>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
 >>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
 > up
 >>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orignal
 >>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
 > sink
 >>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
 >>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
 > that
 >>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
 >>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is
 > ,
 >>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
 >>>
 >>>
 >>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
 >>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
 >>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were

> them,
>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
>>>
>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
> of
>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
> current
>>> offering, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
> 3-15k
>>> would do it..
>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 21:53:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good Points Chris:) Still, my initial point was concerning about the lack of mid-level pro DSP based DAWs. Digi's answer to my question (HD2 Axcel/with Control 24..Slew of plugs) 25k..!! I know this setup works well,but we are talking about 25k :) Surely, there must be a manufacturer that can deliver a simular product for less?? LaMont

"Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:

>
>"Lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>>Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2) very
>>expensive.. think about it..??
>
>But you don't have to play it. Do you change the way you work every two
>years, or does the percieved need change? Did you need 64 tracks of audio
>last year and all of a sudden need 96 tracks? Is the new uberhog reverb
>really that much better that you need a new computer every two years?
>
>I used to be caught up in the speed race myself. Upgrading from a 800 MHz
>processor, to a 900, to a 1200, etc. It all seems pretty silly now. I
stopped
>at an Athlon XP1400+ and life has been sweet ever since. I get the 24 tracks
>of 24/44.1 audio and 7-8 plugs that I need. My computer hasn't crashed
in
>over 3 years. When I was running Paris, I had problems on a daily basis.
> Life has been productive and sweet since going native.

>
>-Chris
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [TCB](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 23:04:13 GMT

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

Hmmmmmm. Don't shoot the messenger here but I don't think the hardware accelerated recording systems are worth the extra money these days. That is, Paris/PT/Sonic/TripleDAT/ETC were really designed to overcome a problem that ended a while ago--latency. Remember, back in the day 30 ms latency on a native system was considered good. I'm talking, like Mac 603/604 days when you had to monitor via hardware to track. At that point PARIS was a real bargain (why I bought it). But today I think PARIS-like systems fundamentally solve a latency problem that no longer exists. Sure there are other advantages to mixing on a hardware based system but they're all easy to work around while latency isn't.

So the economics in the 2-3k range becomes yesterday's PT or PARIS or native. Native means 1k computer, 1k software, 1k interface, and let's tell the truth that 1k software can be reduced if one is willing to cut some corners and run the odd crack. That's the user economics. The vendor economics are, "Do I want to spend all of this money on DSP programmers and chip foundry guys to get a hardware system to market or should I partner up someone else and make my stuff work with theirs?" I mean, that's why M-Audio and Digi are such a good fit. Native systems with M-Audio and a gentler path to the high end (10k) stuff if things go well.

To me it's a little like the hardware synth world. There are 100 good reasons to do software and three good reasons to do hardware. Remember the Hartmann Neuron? The greatest synth you never used. Stephan Sprenger, the DSP man behind that synth, is a dear friend of mine--I flew to Germany for his wedding. I met Axel Hartmann who was the coolest, most fascinating guy you could ever meet. Axel did the interface for the Neuron and the Microwave XT and a whole bunch of other super cool stuff. But they were selling the finest horse and buggy ever made five years after Henry Ford brought out the Model T. Now, I look at everything out there and I doubt I'll buy another hardware synth. Even the Creamware stuff, great sonics, I'd love to buy one, but why not go with the native stuff that is basically as good but more future proofed?

But that's just me. I think the 3k range is just native land now. And I am SSSOOOOOOOO tempted to buy an old crusty PARIS system just to mix the Mold Monkeys. 32 tracks of PARIS would freaking rule for this band, and I could slave up all of my geeky synth shit to it in my sleep. No! Stop! No more PARIS!

TCB

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:

>

>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has no

> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??

>

>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699) &

>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield pro

>results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other than

>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years

>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..

>

>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that served

>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.

> AND That's the point..

>

>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that native's

>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even more,

>it's a known fact that, if you wew to build your native system up to Pro

>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to an

>PT HD system.

>There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between

>PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??

>

>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:

>-The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability

>to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found

>in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities

>to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.

This

>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their SX-1

>was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product

>first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..

>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool

>DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..

>

>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW,

>we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster

>Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I

>say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)

>
>
>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up
>a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original
>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they sink
>another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it that
>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is
,
>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>
>
>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
>support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAC lovers and users. If I were them,
>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...:) Sorry.
>
>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of
>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your current
>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say 3-15k
>would do it..
>Okay end of rant..LaMont
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 15 Jan 2006 23:37:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Maybe we should start a gearsluttery support group, although I think we would only "support" our own addiction.

A quad dual core board would really be nice. There's your \$10k next gen DAW - 1.5ms latency on pretty much everything (possible less with Lynx cards, or so I hear - 0.7ms?).

You can already buy preconfigured DAW PCs, but in a year or two, we'll be looking at 5 or so different DAW manufacturers - all of them former PC builders, offering fully rackable, single enclosure solutions with your choice of Apogee, Mytek, Lynx, RME, etc. ADDA, software system of your choice, soft synth and plugin bundles, large widescreen LCD, with options for controller/keyboard combos. Dedicated systems will be scrambling to offer equally flexible and cross compatible solutions.

Dedric

On 1/15/06 5:16 PM, in article 43cad7d5\$1 @linux, "Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:

> 900% more to get a 2% performance increase. Gearsluttery is a bad disease
> IMHO that get's in the way of truly getting the most out of what you already
> have. And I still catch bad bouts of it myself ;-)

>

> -Chris

>

> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>

>> Good Points Chris:) Still, my initial point was concerning about the lack
>> of mid-level pro DSP based DAWs. Digi's answer to my question (HD2 Axcel/
>> with Control 24..Slew of plugs) 25k..!! I know this setup works well,but
>> we are talking about 25k :) Surely, there must be a manufacturer that can
>> deliver a simular product for less?? LaMont

>>

>>

>> "Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:

>>>

>>> "Lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>>

>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
> very

>>>> expensive.. think about it..??

>>>

>>> But you don't have to play it. Do you change the way you work every two
>>> years, or does the percieved need change? Did you need 64 tracks of audio
>>> last year and all of a sudden need 96 tracks? Is the new uberhog reverb
>>> really that much better that you need a new computer every two years?

>>>

>>> I used to be caught up in the speed race myself. Upgrading from a 800
> MHz

>>> processor, to a 900, to a 1200, etc. It all seems pretty silly now. I

>> stopped

>>> at an Athlon XP1400+ and life has been sweet ever since. I get the 24
> tracks

>>> of 24/44.1 audio and 7-8 plugs that I need. My computer hasn't crashed
>> in

>>> over 3 years. When I was running Paris, I had problems on a daily basis.

>>> Life has been productive and sweet since going native.

>>>

>>> -Chris

>>>

>>

>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Chris Wargo](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 00:16:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's already been said in other responses which I agree with. I don't think DSP DAWs are necessary anymore, and I don't think it makes sense to try to develop a competing system to PT. Digi keeps the model going to keep their stranglehold on a closed system that needs to be completely overhauled (i.e., repurchased) every 4-5 years. I don't think that there is anything inherently pro about DSP DAWs other than the perception. I agree that the cost of owning a native system can approach a PT rig, but I think that is a matter of paying 900% more to get a 2% performance increase. Gearsluttery is a bad disease IMHO that gets in the way of truly getting the most out of what you already have. And I still catch bad bouts of it myself ;-)

-Chris

"LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
>Good Points Chris:) Still, my initial point was concerning about the lack
>of mid-level pro DSP based DAWs. Digi's answer to my question (HD2 Axcel/
>with Control 24..Slew of plugs) 25k..!! I know this setup works well,but
>we are talking about 25k :) Surely, there must be a manufacturer that can
>deliver a similar product for less?? LaMont

>
>
>"Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:

>>
>>"Lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>>Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>>>Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
very
>>>expensive.. think about it..??

>>
>>But you don't have to play it. Do you change the way you work every two
>>years, or does the perceived need change? Did you need 64 tracks of audio
>>last year and all of a sudden need 96 tracks? Is the new uberhog reverb
>>really that much better that you need a new computer every two years?

>>
>>I used to be caught up in the speed race myself. Upgrading from a 800
MHz

>>processor, to a 900, to a 1200, etc. It all seems pretty silly now. I
>stopped

>>at an Athlon XP1400+ and life has been sweet ever since. I get the 24
tracks

>>of 24/44.1 audio and 7-8 plugs that I need. My computer hasn't crashed
>in

>>over 3 years. When I was running Paris, I had problems on a daily basis.

>> Life has been productive and sweet since going native.

>>

>>-Chris

>>

>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [emarenot](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 03:00:17 GMT

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

Am I hearing you right? Sounds like you're looking for an upgrade path that will provide you with relatively stable systems along the way. If that's the case, I hear you. Upgrading and having to shake out the bugs, when the clock is ticking, is a DRAG.

Nice thread.

MR

"LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:43ca95c4\$1@linux...

>

> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need what
> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
discussion)." >

>

> Agreed.. :)

> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies of
> mine in town, were having this same discussion about a month or so ago. They
> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consensus for us all is
that

> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the
non-computer

> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology, that
> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed
> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out
having

> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "treadmill" if you will. I've been on
> that treadmill since 97, and as I look back on how many great working
system

> setups I've destroyed due because I was trying to play the CPU speed game.

> I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems were
> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and OS..

> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9
that's

> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
stable

> stable:)

>

> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s to

> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces due

> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our

conversations

> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT Radar

> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a solid

working

> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the client..

>

> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated dsp

system

> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China

(Phonic

> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding

> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?

> LaMont

>

>

>

>

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

> >

> >Lamont wrote:

> >> Hey Jaimie,

> >>

> >> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off

cheap.

> >> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)

> very

> >> expensive.. think about it..??

> >

> >Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less

> >expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end a

> >Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and an

> >inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.

> >

> >Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need

> >(what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this

>

> >discussion).

> >

> >There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own

> >mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a

> >computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast

> >computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're

>

> >available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
> >particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
> >computer-based systems.
> >
> >Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of the
>
> >advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
> >disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>
> >PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
> >
> >I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along the
>
> >way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and it
> >was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
> >software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
> >features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just
> >as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
> >running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
> >
> >PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
> >freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,
>
> >but forever short. So I sold it.
> >
> >Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP for
>
> >the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
> >running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
> >native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>
> >The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
> >much covered it.
> >
> >I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>
> >to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
system.
> >
> >After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software and
>
> >i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
> >upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
> >OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
> >costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
> >
> >If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
> >or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM and

> >HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some third
>
> >party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
> >Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under 10K.
>
> >Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may
vary.
> >
> >My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need to
> >upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
> >slowing me down.
> >
> >However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
> >production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra cost.
> >
> >
> >> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the native
> cpu
> >> is a secondary issue.
> >
> >With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited DSP
>
> >system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years, the
>
> >cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
>
> >a newer, faster computer.
> >
> >And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
> >that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
> >software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
> >whatever else you do), in one shot.
> >
> >
> >Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
> >> enviorment..
> >
> >This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
> >setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through Logic
>
> >the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
> >
> >The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
> >outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
> >software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software. If I
>
> >need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
> >

> >I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can get
> >moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
> >which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part of
>
> >the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to the
>
> >precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
> >
> >
> >The sad truth with most if not all native solutions is that
> >> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, in which native
users
> >> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
converters..All
> >> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
> does
> >> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they
could've
> >> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
> >
> >A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers to
> >choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
> >under, your system will not hit a dead end.
> >
> >Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
> >system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
> >
> >
> >> Having used nuendo since its inception (2000,), logic audio, I can with
> hesitation,
> >> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and
truth
> >> be known, Steinberg's way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be
desired..
> >
> >A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
> >Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving
>
> >fader controller and you're well under 10K.
> >
> >It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really
>
> >saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
> >looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
> >
> >OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
> >enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
> >with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.

> >
> > Cheers,
> > -Jamie
> > <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >> Take care,
> >> Lamont
> >> take care
> >>
> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs are
> >>
> >>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>
> >>> faster?
> >>>
> >>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money
>
> >>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
> >>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
> >>>
> >>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five year
> >>
> >>
> >>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
> >>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>
> >>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.
> >>>
> >>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into more
> >>
> >>
> >>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>
> >>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go with
>
> >>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
> >>>
> >>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of PPC
>
> >>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which has
>
> >>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue

>
> >>>to work after the Intel transition.
> >>>
> >>>Cheers,
> >>> -Jamie
> >>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>LaMont wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
> >>>>
> >>>>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
has
> >>
> >> no
> >>
> >>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
> >>>>
> >>>>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
DP(699)
> >>
> >> &
> >>
> >>>>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield
> pro
> >>>>results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture
other
> >>
> >> than
> >>
> >>>>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6
years
> >>>>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
Soundscape..
> >>>>
> >>>>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product
that
> >>
> >> served
> >>
> >>>>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
revolutionary.
> >>>> AND That's the point..
> >>>>
> >>>>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your
only
> >>>>other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that

> naitive's
> >>>>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP
DAW..Even
> >>
> >> more,
> >>
> >>>>it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to
> >>
> >> Pro
> >>
> >>>>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
> >>
> >> an
> >>
> >>>>PT HD system.
> >>>>There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap
> between
> >>>>PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
> >>>>
> >>>>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
> >>>>-The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
capability
> >>>>to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
found
> >>>>in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the
capabilities
> >>>>to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
> >>
> >> This
> >>
> >>>>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
> >>
> >> SX-1
> >>
> >>>>was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
product
> >>>>first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
> >>>>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very
cool
> >>>>DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
> >>>>
> >>>>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
> >>
> >> DAW,
> >>
> >>>>we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
> faster
> >>>>Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough

> already..I
> >>>>say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
again..:)
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on
www.gearslutz.com
> >>>>about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k
converters..
> >>>>I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
> >>
> >> up
> >>
> >>>>a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
Orignal
> >>>>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
> >>
> >> sink
> >>
> >>>>another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
ssound..
> >>>>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
> >>
> >> that
> >>
> >>>>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
jsut
> >>>>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
> is
> >>
> >> ,
> >>
> >>>>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for
> HD..
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
software
> >>>>support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not
> even
> >>>>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
> >>
> >> them,
> >>
> >>>>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
> >>>>
> >>>>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
> >>

> >> of
> >>
> >>>>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
> >>
> >> current
> >>
> >>>>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
> >>
> >> 3-15k
> >>
> >>>>would do it..
> >>>>Okay end of rant..LaMont
> >>>>
> >>
> >>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 03:14:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Mike,
Yep, youre right in your evaluation. I just find the current mid-level pro offerings lacking,if non existent..

"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

>Am I hearing you right? Sounds like you're looking for an upgrade path that
>will provide you with relitively stable systems along the way. If that's
>the case, I hear you. Upgrading and having to shake out the bugs, when the
>clock is ticking, is a DRAG.

>

>Nice thread.

>MR

>

>

>

>"LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:43ca95c4\$1@linux...

>>

>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
what

>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>discussion)."

>>

>> Agreed.. :)

>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
of

>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so ago.

They

>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consensus for us all is

>that

>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the

>non-computer

>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology, that

>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed

>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out

>having

>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "treadmill" if you will. I've been

on

>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working

>system

>> setups I've destroyed due because I was trying to play the CPU sped game.

>> I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems were

>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and OS..

>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9

>that's

>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable

>stable

>> stable:)

>>

>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s

to

>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces due

>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our

>conversations

>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT Radar

>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a solid

>working

>> system, that you do not have to make excuses to yourself and the client..

>>

>> Dedicric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated dsp

>system

>> maybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China

>(Phonic

>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding

>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?

>> LaMont

>>

>>

>>

>>

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

>> >

>> >Lamont wrote:

>> >> Hey Jaimie,

>> >>

>> >> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off
>cheap.
>> >> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>> very
>> >> expensive.. think about it..??
>> >
>> >Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>> >expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end a
>> >Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and an
>> >inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.
>> >
>> >Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>> >(what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>
>> >discussion).
>> >
>> >There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>> >mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>> >computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>> >computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>
>> >available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>> >particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>> >computer-based systems.
>> >
>> >Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of the
>>
>> >advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>> >disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>
>> >PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>> >
>> >I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along the
>>
>> >way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and it
>> >was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>> >software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>> >features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just
>> >as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>> >running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>> >
>> >PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
>> >freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,
>>
>> >but forever short. So I sold it.
>> >
>> >Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP for
>>

>> >the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>> >running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>> >native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>
>> >The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>> >much covered it.
>> >
>> >I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>
>> >to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>system.
>> >
>> >After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
and
>>
>> >i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>> >upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>> >OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>> >costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>> >
>> >If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>> >or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM and
>> >HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some third
>>
>> >party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>> >Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under 10K.
>>
>> >Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may
>vary.
>> >
>> >My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need to
>> >upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
>> >slowing me down.
>> >
>> >However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
>> >production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra cost.
>> >
>> >
>> >> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the native
>> >cpu
>> >> is a secondary issue.
>> >
>> >With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
DSP
>>
>> >system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
the
>>

>> >cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
>>
>> >a newer, faster computer.
>> >
>> >And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>> >that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>> >software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>> >whatever else you do), in one shot.
>> >
>> >
>> >Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>> >> environment..
>> >
>> >This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>> >setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through Logic
>>
>> >the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>> >
>> >The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>> >outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>> >software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software. If
I
>>
>> >need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>> >
>> >I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can get
>> >moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>> >which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
of
>>
>> >the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to the
>>
>> >precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>> >
>> >
>> >The sad truth with most if not all native solutions is that
>> >> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, in which native
>users
>> >> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>converters..All
>> >> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
>> does
>> >> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they
>could've
>> >> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>> >
>> >A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers to
>> >choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes

>> >under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>> >
>> >Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>> >system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>> >
>> >
>> >> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can with
>> hesitation,
>> >> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and
>truth
>> >> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be
>desired..
>> >
>> >A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
>> >Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving
>>
>> >fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>> >
>> >It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really
>>
>> >saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>> >looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>> >
>> >OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>> >enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>> >with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>> >
>> >Cheers,
>> > -Jamie
>> > <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >> Take care,
>> >> Lamont
>> >> take care
>> >>
>> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >>
>> >>>I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs
>> are
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>>
>> >>>faster?
>> >>>

>> >>>The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money
>>
>> >>>on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>> >>>There's no real cure for that. :^)
>> >>>
>> >>>It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five
year
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>> >>>choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>>
>> >>>starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.
>> >>>
>> >>>Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
more
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>
>> >>>The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go with
>>
>> >>>Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>> >>>
>> >>>If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of
PPC
>>
>> >>>choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
has
>>
>> >>>more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>
>> >>>to work after the Intel transition.
>> >>>
>> >>>Cheers,
>> >>> -Jamie
>> >>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>LaMont wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>>>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>has
>> >>
>> >> no
>> >>

>> >>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>> >>>>
>> >>>>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
>DP(699)
>> >>
>> >> &
>> >>
>> >>>>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield
>> pro
>> >>>>results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture
>other
>> >>
>> >> than
>> >>
>> >>>>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6
>years
>> >>>>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>Soundscape..
>> >>>>
>> >>>>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product
>that
>> >>
>> >> served
>> >>
>> >>>>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
>revolutionary.
>> >>>> AND That's the point..
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your
>only
>> >>>>other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that
>> native's
>> >>>>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP
>DAW..Even
>> >>
>> >> more,
>> >>
>> >>>>it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your native system up
>to
>> >>
>> >> Pro
>> >>
>> >>>>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come
>to
>> >>
>> >> an
>> >>
>> >>>>PT HD system.

>> >>>> There has to be a manufacturer that will stand up and fill in the gap
>> between
>> >>>> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>> >>>> -The Mackie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens) that also had the
> capability
>> >>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
> found
>> >>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the
> capabilities
>> >>>> to add up to 3 or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>> >>
>> >> This
>> >>
>> >>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
>> >>
>> >> SX-1
>> >>
>> >>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was an Ensoniq/EMU
> product
>> >>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam.. I digress..
>> >>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a very
> cool
>> >>>> DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>> >>>>
>> >>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
>> >>
>> >> DAW,
>> >>
>> >>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
>> faster
>> >>>> Cpus.. In which, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon. Enough
>> already.. I
>> >>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) I digress
> again..:)
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on
> www.gearsllutz.com
>> >>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k
> converters..
>> >>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>> >>
>> >> up
>> >>
>> >>>> a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
> Original

>> >>>>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
>> >>
>> >> sink
>> >>
>> >>>>another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
>ssound..
>> >>>>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
>> >>
>> >> that
>> >>
>> >>>>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
>jsut
>> >>>>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
>> is
>> >>
>> >> ,
>> >>
>> >>>>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for
>> HD..
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
>software
>> >>>>support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not
>> even
>> >>>>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
>> >>
>> >> them,
>> >>
>> >>>>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>> >>
>> >> of
>> >>
>> >>>>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than
your
>> >>
>> >> current
>> >>
>> >>>>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along
say
>> >>
>> >> 3-15k
>> >>
>> >>>>would do it..

>> >>>>Okay end of rant..LaMont
>> >>>>
>> >>
>> >>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 03:19:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Chris,
Great Post :)..But, you have to agree that although PT HD/Mix systems are expensive, they deliver big time, with great i/o flexibility to integrate hardware. If you purchase or build the spec'd digi ssystem, then you are assured maximum results. But, you'll pay for it \$\$\$\$\$:)
LaMont

"Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:

>
>It's already been said in other responses which I agree with. I don't think
>DSP DAWs are nescesary anymore, and I don't think it makes sense to try
to
>develop a competeing system to PT. Digi keeps the model going to keep thier
>stranglehold on a closed system that needs to be completely overhauled (i.e.,
>repurchased) every 4-5 years. I don't think that there is anything inherently
>pro about DSP DAWs other than the perception. I agree that the cost of
owning
>a native system can approach a PT rig, but I think that is a matter of paying
>900% more to get a 2% performance increase. Gearsluttery is a bad disease
>IMHO that get's in the way of truly getting the most out of what you already
>have. And I still catch bad bouts of it myself ;-)
>
>-Chris

>
>"LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>
>>Good Points Chris:) Still, my initial point was concerning about the lack
>>of mid-level pro DSP based DAWs. Digi's answer to my question (HD2 Axcel/
>>with Control 24..Slew of plugs) 25k..!! I know this setup works well,but
>>we are talking about 25k :) Surely, there must be a manufacturer that can
>>deliver a simular product for less?? LaMont

>>
>>

>>"Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:

>>>
>>>"Lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>>>>Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>very
>>>>expensive.. think about it..??
>>>
>>>But you don't have to play it. Do you change the way you work every two
>>>years, or does the percieved need change? Did you need 64 tracks of audio
>>>last year and all of a sudden need 96 tracks? Is the new uberhog reverb
>>>really that much better that you need a new computer every two years?
>>>
>>>I used to be caught up in the speed race myself. Upgrading from a 800
>MHz
>>>processor, to a 900, to a 1200, etc. It all seems pretty silly now.
I
>>stopped
>>>at an Athlon XP1400+ and life has been sweet ever since. I get the 24
>tracks
>>>of 24/44.1 audio and 7-8 plugs that I need. My computer hasn't crashed
>>in
>>>over 3 years. When I was running Paris, I had problems on a daily basis.
>>> Life has been productive and sweet since going native.
>>>
>>>-Chris
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 03:28:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Dedic,
Great outlook towards the future of DAWs. As I'm reading you view, which is totally realistic, I start feeling like I'm getting back on the PC/Mac Treadmill again.

My view or wish would be a system like the Mackie DXB/ DM2000/Nuendo with an integrated 48,64,128 track 24/192 recorder..All in one unit. With a customeized OS (OSX or Win64,Karsyn (Neko sys)..Since this Mixer supports up to 4 UAD cards as well as Vst plugs, flexibility is at hand..
I us the PC to record midi(back the MPC), so having an integrated midi sequencer is not a biggie(for me)..

I'd pay for an almost closed system descibed above in a heart beat. Off the

treadmill, and back to work..

You're right, we may need gearslut recovery site for sure.:)
Take care..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Maybe we should start a gearsluttery support group, although I think we
>would only "support" our own addiction.

>

>A quad dual core board would really be nice. There's your \$10k next gen
DAW

>- 1.5ms latency on pretty much everything (possible less with Lynx cards,
or

>so I hear - 0.7ms?).

>

>You can already buy preconfigured DAW PCs, but in a year or two, we'll be
>looking at 5 or so different DAW manufacturers - all of them former PC
>builders, offering fully rackable, single enclosure solutions with your
>choice of Apogee, Mytek, Lynx, RME, etc. ADDA, software system of your
>choice, soft synth and plugin bundles, large widescreen LCD, with options
>for controller/keyboard combos. Dedicated systems will be scrambling to
>offer equally flexible and cross compatible solutions.

>

>Dedric

>

>On 1/15/06 5:16 PM, in article 43cad7d5\$1@linux, "Chris Wargo" <na@na.na>
>wrote:

>

>> 900% more to get a 2% performance increase. Gearsluttery is a bad disease
>> IMHO that get's in the way of truly getting the most out of what you already
>> have. And I still catch bad bouts of it myself ;-)

>>

>> -Chris

>>

>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>>

>>> Good Points Chris:) Still, my initial point was concerning about the
lack

>>> of mid-level pro DSP based DAWs. Digi's answer to my question (HD2 Axcel/
>>> with Control 24..Slew of plugs) 25k..!! I know this setup works well,but
>>> we are talking about 25k :) Surely, there must be a manufacturer that
can

>>> deliver a simular product for less?? LaMont

>>>

>>>

>>> "Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:

>>>>
>>>> "Lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off
cheap.
>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>> very
>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>
>>>> But you don't have to play it. Do you change the way you work every
two
>>>> years, or does the percieved need change? Did you need 64 tracks of
audio
>>>> last year and all of a sudden need 96 tracks? Is the new uberhog reverb
>>>> really that much better that you need a new computer every two years?
>>>>
>>>> I used to be caught up in the speed race myself. Upgrading from a 800
>> MHz
>>>> processor, to a 900, to a 1200, etc. It all seems pretty silly now.
|
>>> stopped
>>>> at an Athlon XP1400+ and life has been sweet ever since. I get the
24
>> tracks
>>>> of 24/44.1 audio and 7-8 plugs that I need. My computer hasn't crashed
>>> in
>>>> over 3 years. When I was running Paris, I had problems on a daily basis.
>>>> Life has been productive and sweet since going native.
>>>>
>>>>> -Chris
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [TC](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 03:31:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I got into PT HD by buying and upgrading used systems, so the cost wasn't as bad.

I run Logic also under DAE/HTDM and it's great to have the extra power and TDM plugs in logic
along side vst, AU etc, along with a UAD card.

Still love paris too..

Cheers,

TC

LaMont wrote:

- > Hey Chris,
- > Great Post :)..But, you have to agree that although PT HD/Mix systems are
- > expensive, they deliver big time, with great i/o flexibility to integrate
- > hardware. If you purchase or build the spec'd digi ssystem, then you are assured
- > maximun results. But, you'll pay for it \$\$\$\$\$\$:)
- > LaMont
- >
- >

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 03:46:18 GMT

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

To me having to switch between apps for midi or audio is a limitation I'm trying to get away from - having both together greatly increases my productivity and creativity, so that's the draw with Nuendo, and significant negative for ProTools (never liked the editing workflow either - something about it seems archaic, a la Avid, rather than intuitive).

Spec'ing and building DAW systems is no big deal for me, as I am sure for you and most people here, so maybe we are in the minority. Sure, the time spent doing so gets to be a drag - I'm with you there, but it's worth it to me and my company. Upgrading a ProTools rig for similar functionality would cost me many times more - just doesn't make sense unless money is of little concern.

As far as managing I/O - I agree that is a limitation with native rigs due to the layer of ASIO and external I/O hardware in terms of simplicity - functionality is there. Getting around Totalmix routing, for example, on top of Nuendo routing, and still not having a simple solution for push-button rerouting can be a pain, but once a system is set, it can be workable.

Nuendo's control room in 3.2 is a big step in the right direction (sure made my life easier), and apparently that is only part of the story yet to unfold with Nuendo. Steinberg's goal, I believe, is for Nuendo to be the control center for any size studio's full routing and monitoring functionality - with or without a console (e.g. direct Euphonix and SSL integration, or standalone). For sure ProTools has a very effective routing approach, even if a bit in-elegant and tech-geekish in implementation, but you do pay a premium to get gear that all has the same logo.

I think we'll see very well integrated, complete systems with other DAW

software in the not too distant future. VST 3.0, if it ever gets released, will likely help. Nuendo 4.0 could also tilt the scales if I'm guessing right about studio implementation, but that remains to be seen.

If you really want a mid-level dsp-based DAW, I think Pyramix and Soundscape are your only options currently, but I don't like the limited plugin and 3rd party support by either. At least they do fit the bill of being integrated solutions from one manufacturer. I had considered getting an I/O box from Soundscape/Sydec to use with Nuendo, but lost interest when I realized I would have to use their mixer - e.g. Back to the joy of routing between DAWs just to get one plugin in the chain. Not a time saver for me, so that makes it a deal breaker.

Regards,
Dedric

On 1/15/06 8:51 PM, in article 43cb0a4b\$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> Hey Dedric,
>
> First, I just completed mixing an entire album using Nuendo/RME. The clients
> like it very much. So, I know how to make Nuendo work.. To me, Nuendo/SX
> makes you work harder for projects over 50 tracks in R & B music.
>
> Much easier to mix in Paris & Pro Tools. And, there is a difference in sound..
>
> My interpretation as "Pro" DAW, starts a "total System Package". Meaning
> software & hardware from a given manufacturer that will allow limitless i/o,
> patchbay functionality.
>
> I'm not saying that Nuendo is not a Pro Product, it is, just like Logic Audio,
> DP, Sonar, Samplitude, SX, Vegas.. I own all except, samplitude & sonar, and
> I get great results from each.
>
> However, do I feel that without some fader package, upgraded converters, off
> shelf DSP cards, the experience and workflow suffers greatly.
>
> My original post was only to point out that since Paris demise, no other
> manufacturer
> has brought to market a "Total Solution" package for the mid ground. Yes
> we have the software like Nuendo, but, what about matching some hardware
> with it, and a Spec'd system (Mac/PC) that's sold as a Package.
>
> Now we only have LE, and all the natives. You're left to piece-mill a package
> yourself. But, it's been my experience as a DAW consultant/Builder, that
> way too much time is spent on specing and little time working..

>
> Say what you want about Digi, they sell a package. note: Most studio
> are still running the old PT Mix system. hey, it works with just a Mac G4
> of some kind.. So, you don't have to upgrade to HD.. But, Hey their new mixer
> controllers are terrific!! but expensive :) Still, they have a system that
> works well if you follow their specs to the letter.
>
> Again, I'm not saying that my Nuendo setup is not stable ,it is. It (Nuendo)
> shuts down only when I'm done working in it. That's saying a lot about
> the Software.. But, VSt2 as it stands today, is very clumsy in handling i/o
> integration. Now, to some bigtime Nuendo users who have an SSL, Trident
> console front-ending their rig, then it's mute point, but to those who are
> mixing ITB, it's a major pain..
> LaMont
>
>
>
>
>
>
> rry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> Hi Lamont,
>>
>>> The reason I don't consider nuendo/sx as pro is because, it's only
>>> software..
>>
>> That in fact proves my point - "pro" has become much more of a personal
>> perception driven by marketing and peer pressure than the actual definition.
>> For example in another industry, to some video houses, a \$50,000 Avid rig
>> may not be pro compared to a \$200,000 Quantel system, but both will do much
>> the same thing - deliver professional results - with differences that may
> be
>> key for the specific user (broadcast vs. post, etc), but not the definition
>> of "pro" in general.
>>
>> Saying software isn't "pro" is missing the point of being a pro. Pro is
>> about getting paid for what you do because you deliver quality results and
>> products that someone else is willing to pay for. In another post you said
>> that Chinese products offer an astounding value for the money. To me that's
>> a rather astounding paradox to your definition. They are a good
>> cost/performance ratio, but it is contradictory to say that Nuendo isn't
> pro
>> and a C1 mic is, in the same breath. I haven't heard a Chinese mic that
>> compared to what I would consider, and choose as a "pro" mic (whether higher
>> end "pro" from Lawson, Blue or Neumann, or a mid-grade Audio Technica).
>>
>> Yes, it takes converters, etc, to augment Nuendo for use in various
>> situations, but the same is true of ProTools (ProTools isn't much good
>> without an I/O box). Just because Digi sells it as one package doesn't

> make
>> it pro. And you have an expensive upgrade path - much more than upgrade
> PCs
>> every couple of years. I've done the math on this many times (including
>> comparing UAD-1 cards to the TDM equivalents in terms of plugin counts per
>> dollar - UAD-1 cards win easily).
>>
>> I use my Nuendo rig and many other software, and hardware tools day in and
>> day out producing media for a variety of professional clients in a very
>> professional setting. We have office/studio space in the world headquarters
>> for one of our main clients. Should I tell them that since I don't have
>> ProTools and a Euphonix or Neve console (yet) to make it look bigger and
>> costs them more than it needs to does that make us less pro? No. Attitude
>> and quality product delivery are what make us pro. Maybe Nuendo doesn't
>> work for you, aor maybe you haven't decided to make it work for you, but
> it
>> does work for a lot of other "professionals" like myself.
>>
>> Manufacturers and marketing departments define the line between Pro and
>> Consumer when they add one feature or part that costs more than they believe
>> they can sell to the average consumer, so they almost haphazardly label
> it
>> "Pro" and double the price. We then blindly adopt that as the "pro"
>> standard and thumb our noses at consumer gear.
>>
>> It really irritates me when people arrogantly define pro as what they, or
>> someone else has based on how expensive (e.g. Over a randomly chosen
>> pricepoint) and popular it is, and non-pro as anything that isn't all of
> the
>> above. That just isn't fair, objective, or pro in my book.
>>
>> It is sad that the media and arts production industry has increasingly come
>> to define the word "pro" by how much it costs to buy rather than the quality
>> of the product. Anyone ever see "Gigli" or heard of Britney Spears? I
> rest
>> my case. ;-)
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>> Echo Media Group, LLC
>>
>> On 1/15/06 11:22 AM, in article 43ca84bf\$1@linux, "Lamont"
>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> Hey Dedic,
>>>
>>> The reason I dont consider nuendo/sx as pro is beacause, it's only

>>> software..To
>>> get that and any native base app to pro standards in a day/out studio
>>> situation
>>> will cost you: Control surface unit, good converters, monitoring/talk
> back
>>> unit, and lets not forget the blazing cpu thatsd needed for low-latency,
>>> big toime plugins..
>>>
>>> I'm not saying, that pro can't use natives, we do..It;s just like BrianT's
>>> nuendo system(s)..He manning his nuendo systems using theEuphonics system
>>> 5 system..can we say, that will and does take his system to a new level??
>>> But, we all know, thtats what BT demands from a system..
>>> mt point in the post was not ask a question "where is the development
> for
>>> the 5-10k crowd?? Sure digi is covering the high end, with their new mixer
>>> controllers both offering great monitoring ,talkback, and tight software
>>> integration..I ca'nt believe that in the year 2006, no manufacture can
> com
>>> out with a cheaper solution than digi??...
>>> takecare..
>>> lamont
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> dric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> A curiosity question - why do you not consider Nuendo, Logic etc, "pro
>>>> DAWs"? Let's look back a bit - DAWs of any nature weren't considered
> "pro"
>>>> when first offering an alternative to tape and a \$500,000 console.
>>>> Technology advances, ProTools becomes more and more popular, and the
> name
>>>> sticks - it's now "pro". Then Paris, which was not considered pro when
>>>> Ensoniq first launched it, caught on in a small community and by Paris
>>>> users, it is considered "pro". Just a semantics question perhaps, but
> it
>>>> does make me wonder if each market that finds the tool they like, considers
>>>> it "pro" because it works for them. I know of no standard to define
> the
>>>> term outside of what that tool does for one's income.
>>>>
>>>> Anyway, other dedicated dsp systems: Pyramix (www.merging.com). Soundscape
>>>> - still popular in Europe I believe (<http://www.sydec.be/>).
>>>>
>>>> I think as others are pointing out, the cost and risk of developing
>>>> dedicated dsp is the real issue - faster computers are making the concept
>>>> obsolete to a large market of users, at least for the most part.
>>>>

>>>> In the video world, streaming full resolution, uncompressed HD video
> still
>>>> requires dedicated processing for high speed work (Blackmagic, Canopus,
>>> Avid
>>>> cards, etc), and production houses that require full realtime effects
>>>> require it (render times not acceptable - e.g. Broadcast, networks where
>>>> deadlines are very tight, large commercial production houses, etc - many
>>> use
>>>> high end \$100k+ systems for that, with no more effects or editing
>>>> capability
>>>> than Final Cut Pro, Vegas or Avid Express, but eliminating render times).
>>>>
>>>> However, even that market is changing, granted from the small production
>>>> house up, not yet in the broadcast world. The limitations of native
> there
>>>> are how well a native system can support full resolution high quality
> video
>>>> (cpu/disk load, speed, etc), not the actual editing software's
>>>> functionality
>>>> or "professional" image. So in audio, if one can stream 100 tracks of
> audio
>>>> with full, quality processing and effects, including outboard (more than
>>> I
>>>> could do with my Paris rig), and it earns 100% of one's income, is that
>>> not
>>>> "pro"? It's more than I was doing in studios with 2" tape and only 24
>>>> tracks to work with. :-)
>>>>
>>>> Committing to dedicated DSP is costly and very likely (these days) a
> short
>>>> term investment - that's why no one has jumped in to do it. Mark my
> words,
>>>> Digidesign is building their native holdings for a reason. Eventually
> they
>>>> too will be offering a dual/quad quad core native system with 64-bit
>>>> processing and as much power as and HD3 rig. They've already made an
> old
>>>> technology (motorola dsp) hang on for years after it has been superceded
>>> by
>>>> better dsp solutions (custom asic, or even video graphics chips - UAD,
> and
>>>> whatever the new generic dsp system is - can't recall the name).
>>>>
>>>> Just my .02
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>

>>>> On 1/15/06 1:31 AM, in article 43c9fa54\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>
>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
> has
>>> no
>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>
>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>>> &
>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield
> pro
>>>>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other
>>> than
>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>
>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
>>> served
>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
>>>>> revolutionary.
>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>
>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your
> only
>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that
>>>>> naitive's
>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>>> more,
>>>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to
>>> Pro
>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come
> to
>>> an
>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap
> between
>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>
>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
>>>>> capability
>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
> found

>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>>> This
>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
>>> SX-1
>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very
> cool
>>>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>
>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
>>> DAW,
>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
> faster
>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>> already..I
>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>> again..:)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>> up
>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orginal
>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
>>> sink
>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is
> it
>>> that
>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
> jsut
>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
> is
>>> ,
>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for
> HD..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
> software
>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not
> even
>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
>>> them,
>>>> I would not upgrade for at leat 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.

>>>>>
>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>>> of
>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
>>> current
>>>>> offering, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
>>> 3-15k
>>>>> would do it..
>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 03:51:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Dedic,

First, I just completed mixing an entire album usnig Nuendo/RME. The clients like it very much. So, I knwoo how to make Nuendo work.. To me , Neundo/SX makes you work harder for projects over 50 tracks in R & B music.

Much easier to mix in Paris & Pro Tools. And, there is a difference in sound..

My interpretation as "Pro" DAW, starts a "total System Package". Meaning software 7 Hardware from a given manufacturer that will allow limitless i/o, patchbay functionality.

I'm not saying that Nuendo is not a Pro Product,it is, just liek Logic Audio, DP, Sonar,Samplitude, SX,Vegas..I own all execpt, samplitude & sonar, and I get great results from each.

However, do I feel that without some fader package, upgraded onverters, off shelf DSP cards, the experience and workflow suffers greatly.

My origanl post was only to point out that since Paris demise, no other manufacture has brought to market a "Total Solution" package for the mid ground. Yes we have the software like Nuendo, but, what about matching some hardware with it, and a SPec'd system (Mac/PC) that's sold as a Package.

Now we only have LE, and all the naitives. You'releft to piece-mill a package yourself. But, It's been my experience as a DAW consultant/Builder, that wayy too much time is spent on specing and little time working..

Say what you want about about Digi, they sell a package. note: Most studio are still running the old PT Mix system. hey, it works with just a Mac G4 of some kind.. So, you don't have to upgrade to HD.. But, Hey their new mixer controllers are terrific!! but expensive :) Still, they have a system that works well if you follow their specs to the letter.

Again, I'm not saying that my Nuendo setup is not stable ,it is. It (Nuendo) shuts down only when I'm done working in it. That's saying alot about the Software.. But, VSt2 as it stands today, is very clumsy in handling i/o integration. Now, to some bigtime Nuendo users who have an SSL, Trident console front-ending their rig, then it's mute point, but to those who are mixing ITB, it's a major pain..

LaMont

rry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Hi Lamont,

>

>> The reason I dont consider nuendo/sx as pro is beacause, it's only

>> software..

>

>That in fact proves my point - "pro" has become much more of a personal
>perception driven by marketing and peer pressure than the actual definition.

>For example in another industry, to some video houses, a \$50,000 Avid rig
>may not be pro compared to a \$200,000 Quantel system, but both will do much
>the same thing - deliver professional results - with differences that may
be

>key for the specific user (broadcast vs. post, etc), but not the definition
>of "pro" in general.

>

>Saying software isn't "pro" is missing the point of being a pro. Pro is
>about getting paid for what you do because you deliver quality results and
>products that someone else is willing to pay for. In another post you said
>that Chinese products offer an astounding value for the money. To me that's
>a rather astounding paradox to your definition. They are a good
>cost/performance ratio, but it is contradictory to say that Nuendo isn't
pro

>and a C1 mic is, in the same breath. I haven't heard a Chinese mic that
>compared to what I would consider, and choose as a "pro" mic (whether higher
>end "pro" from Lawson, Blue or Neumann, or a mid-grade Audio Technica).

>

>Yes, it takes converters, etc, to augment Nuendo for use in various
>situations, but the same is true of ProTools (ProTools isn't much good
>without an I/O box). Just because Digi sells it as one package doesn't
make

>it pro. And you have an expensive upgrade path - much more than upgrade PCs

>every couple of years. I've done the math on this many times (including >comparing UAD-1 cards to the TDM equivalents in terms of plugin counts per >dollar - UAD-1 cards win easily).

>

>I use my Nuendo rig and many other software, and hardware tools day in and >day out producing media for a variety of professional clients in a very >professional setting. We have office/studio space in the world headquarters >for one of our main clients. Should I tell them that since I don't have >ProTools and a Euphonix or Neve console (yet) to make it look bigger and >costs them more than it needs to does that make us less pro? No. Attitude >and quality product delivery are what make us pro. Maybe Nuendo doesn't >work for you, aor maybe you haven't decided to make it work for you, but it

>does work for a lot of other "professionals" like myself.

>

>Manufacturers and marketing departments define the line between Pro and >Consumer when they add one feature or part that costs more than they believe >they can sell to the average consumer, so they almost haphazardly label it

>"Pro" and double the price. We then blindly adopt that as the "pro" >standard and thumb our noses at consumer gear.

>

>It really irritates me when people arrogantly define pro as what they, or >someone else has based on how expensive (e.g. Over a randomly chosen >pricepoint) and popular it is, and non-pro as anything that isn't all of the

>above. That just isn't fair, objective, or pro in my book.

>

>It is sad that the media and arts production industry has increasingly come >to define the word "pro" by how much it costs to buy rather than the quality >of the product. Anyone ever see "Gigli" or heard of Britney Spears? I rest

>my case. ;-)

>

>Regards,
>Dedric
>Echo Media Group, LLC

>

>On 1/15/06 11:22 AM, in article 43ca84bf\$1@linux, "Lamont" ><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>>

>> Hey Dedric,

>>

>> The reason I dont consider nuendo/sx as pro is beacause, it's only >> software..To

>> get that and any native base app to pro standards in a day/out studio
>> situation
>> will cost you: Control surface unit, good converters, monitoring/talk
back
>> unit, and lets not forget the blazing cpu thatsd needed for low-latency,
>> big toime plugins..
>>
>> I'm not saying, that pro can't use natives, we do..It;s just like BrianT's
>> nuendo system(s)..He manning his nuendo systems using theEuphonics system
>> 5 system..can we say, that will and does take his system to a new level??
>> But, we all know, thtats what BT demands from a system..
>> mt point in the post was not ask a question "where is the development
for
>> the 5-10k crowd?? Sure digi is covering the high end, with their new mixer
>> controllers both offering great monitoring ,talkback, and tight software
>> integration..I ca'nt believe that in the year 2006, no manufacture can
com
>> out with a cheaper solution than digi??...
>> takecare..
>> lamont
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> dric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> A curiosity question - why do you not consider Nuendo, Logic etc, "pro
>>> DAWs"? Let's look back a bit - DAWs of any nature weren't considered
"pro"
>>> when first offering an alternative to tape and a \$500,000 console.
>>> Technology advances, ProTools becomes more and more popular, and the
name
>>> sticks - it's now "pro". Then Paris, which was not considered pro when
>>> Ensoniq first launched it, caught on in a small community and by Paris
>>> users, it is considered "pro". Just a semantics question perhaps, but
it
>>> does make me wonder if each market that finds the tool they like, considers
>>> it "pro" because it works for them. I know of no standard to define
the
>>> term outside of what that tool does for one's income.
>>>
>>> Anyway, other dedicated dsp systems: Pyramix (www.merging.com). Soundscape
>>> - still popular in Europe I believe (<http://www.sydec.be/>).
>>>
>>> I think as others are pointing out, the cost and risk of developing
>>> dedicated dsp is the real issue - faster computers are making the concept
>>> obsolete to a large market of users, at least for the most part.
>>>
>>> In the video world, streaming full resolution, uncompressed HD video

still

>>> requires dedicated processing for high speed work (Blackmagic, Canopus,
>> Avid
>>> cards, etc), and production houses that require full realtime effects
>>> require it (render times not acceptable - e.g. Broadcast, networks where
>>> deadlines are very tight, large commercial production houses, etc - many
>> use
>>> high end \$100k+ systems for that, with no more effects or editing capability
>>> than Final Cut Pro, Vegas or Avid Express, but eliminating render times).
>>>
>>> However, even that market is changing, granted from the small production
>>> house up, not yet in the broadcast world. The limitations of native
there
>>> are how well a native system can support full resolution high quality
video
>>> (cpu/disk load, speed, etc), not the actual editing software's functionality
>>> or "professional" image. So in audio, if one can stream 100 tracks of
audio
>>> with full, quality processing and effects, including outboard (more than
>> I
>>> could do with my Paris rig), and it earns 100% of one's income, is that
>> not
>>> "pro"? It's more than I was doing in studios with 2" tape and only 24
>>> tracks to work with. :-)
>>>
>>> Committing to dedicated DSP is costly and very likely (these days) a
short
>>> term investment - that's why no one has jumped in to do it. Mark my
words,
>>> Digidesign is building their native holdings for a reason. Eventually
they
>>> too will be offering a dual/quad quad core native system with 64-bit
>>> processing and as much power as and HD3 rig. They've already made an
old
>>> technology (motorola dsp) hang on for years after it has been superceded
>> by
>>> better dsp solutions (custom asic, or even video graphics chips - UAD,
and
>>> whatever the new generic dsp system is - can't recall the name).
>>>
>>> Just my .02
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedic
>>>
>>> On 1/15/06 1:31 AM, in article 43c9fa54\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>

>>>>
>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>
>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
has
>> no
>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>
>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>> &
>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield
pro
>>>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other
>> than
>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>>>>
>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
>> served
>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
>>>> revolutionary.
>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>
>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your
only
>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that
>>>> naitive's
>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>> more,
>>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to
>> Pro
>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come
to
>> an
>>>> PT HD system.
>>>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap
between
>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>
>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
>>>> capability
>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
found
>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>> This
>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their

>> SX-1
>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a very
cool
>>>> DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>
>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
>> DAW,
>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
faster
>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>> already..I
>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>> up
>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original
>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
>> sink
>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is
it
>> that
>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
jsut
>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
is
>> ,
>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for
HD..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
software
>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not
even
>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
>> them,
>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
>>>>
>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>> of
>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
>> current

>>>> offering, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
>> 3-15k
>>>> would do it..
>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 04:08:18 GMT

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

Good Points Thad. I have a really freaked out VSTi PC, that's become my "baby".. To this day, I have not purchased a yammy Motif of any kind. Evertime I get ready to get a Motif, some way cool Vsti comes out like NI's Electrick Piano, Ivory, Motu's Orchestra, Sonic Synth2, BFD, Stylus RMX..MAN!!! That motif purchase, just keeps getting pushed back further and further..)

I still think that DSP based systems has a market,just not at the low end, which is a BIGGGG Market. The mid level market is not as big, as we all found out with Paris.. So, Digi hit's both the Low-end and to top-end. To me, the mid-level is not just a Hyped PC/Mac and converters. Rather it's a system..Not a piece-mill setup.. This is what's driving the "www.gearsnitz.com crowd crazy. They are trying like crazy to get their low-end sytem to at least mid-level ro top-level..

TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>Hmmmmmm. Don't shoot the messenger here but I don't think the hardware accelerated
>recording systems are worth the extra money these days. That is,
Paris/PT/Sonic/TripleDAT/ETC
>were really designed to overcome a problem that ended a while ago--latency.
>Remember, back in the day 30 ms latency on a native system was considered
>good. I'm talking, like Mac 603/604 days when you had to monitor via hardware
>to track. At that point PARIS was a real bargain (why I bought it). But
today
>I think PARIS-like systems fundamentally solve a latency problem that no
>longer exists. Sure there are other advantages to mixing on a hardware based
>system but they're all easy to work around while latency isn't.
>
>So the economics in the 2-3k range becomes yesterday's PT or PARIS or native.
>Native means 1k computer, 1k software, 1k interface, and let's tell the
truth
>that 1k software can be reduced if one is willing to cut some corners and
>run the odd crack. That's the user economics. The vendor economics are,
"Do

>I want to spend all of this money on DSP programmers and chip foundry guys
>to get a hardware system to market or should I partner up someone else and
>make my stuff work with theirs?" I mean, that's why M-Audio and Digi are
>such a good fit. Native systems with M-Audio and a gentler path to the high
>end (10k) stuff if things go well.
>
>To me it's a little like the hardware synth world. There are 100 good reasons
>to do software and three good reasons to do hardware. Remember the Hartmann
>Neuron? The greatest synth you never used. Stephan Sprenger, the DSP man
>behind that synth, is a dear friend of mine--I flew to Germany for his wedding.
>I met Axel Hartmann who was the coolest, most fascinating guy you could
ever
>meet. Axel did the interface for the Neuron and the Micorwave XT and a whole
>bunch of other super cool stuff. But they were selling the finest horse
and
>buggy ever made five years after Henry Ford brought out the Model T. Now,
>I look at everything out there and I doubt I'll buy another hardware synth.
>Even the Creamware stuff, great sonics, I'd love to buy one, but why not
>go with the native stuff that is basically as good but more future proofed?
>
>But that's just me. I think the 3k range is just native land now. And I
>am SSSOOOOOOOOO tempted to buy an old crusty PARIS system just to mix the
>Mold Monkeys. 32 tracks of PARIS would freaking rule for this band, and
I
>could slave up all of my geeky synth shit to it in my sleep. No! Stop! No
>more PARIS!
>
>TCB
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>
>>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
>no
>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>
>>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>&
>>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield pro
>>results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other
>than
>>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>>
>>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
>served
>>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.

>> AND That's the point..

>>

>>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>>other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that naitive's
>>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>more,

>>it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to Pro
>>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
an

>>PT HD system.

>>There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
>>PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??

>>

>>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:

>>-The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
>>to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
>>in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.

>This

>>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
SX-1

>>was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>>first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..

>>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
>>DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..

>>

>>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW,
>>we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
>>Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I
>>say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)

>>

>>

>>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up
>>a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orginal
>>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
sink

>>another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..

>>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
that

>>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is

>,

>>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..

>>

>>

>>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
>>support. do they really think that this was good move now?? I'm not even
>>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were them,
>>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..) Sorry.

>>

>>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of
>>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
current

>>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
3-15k

>>would do it..

>>Okay end of rant..LaMont

>>

>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Chris Wargo](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 05:04:38 GMT

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

LaMont, I agree that a PT system delivers the goods. But you have to admit that they have less flexibility than a native system, no? Is it your experience that you can't get equal performance out of a native system? In terms of track count/plugs or stability?

I see your point that Digi designs and tests complete systems. If you follow their lead, you are working with a system where all the hardware and drivers play nicely together on a computer that has been run through the paces in terms of chipset compatibility and processing power. However, you can (at least in theory) get that from VAR companies like Chatillon, ADK, Wave Digital, et al, who will build you a "Nuendo Computer" with known good hardware and support the entire system. A system like this will still cost much less than any Digi rig and IMHO will likely be equally reliable. Crashes still happen on a digi-approved rig.

If there were another DSP system maker to enter the market, there is nothing to say that they would even venture into total system integration. Ensoniq/Emu never made any chipset/mobo/videocard suggestions, which caused more than a few of us here a lot of grief. If it weren't for this newsgroup, I would have bailed on Paris much sooner. I don't run a commercial studio anymore, but when I did, I was using Paris. I had a lot of problems with my system, through a few different host computer iterations. There were many times I had to shut a session down due to technical issues. I guess this is at the root of why I don't think that a DSP package system is any more pro than a native system built up with hardware from several manufacturers. My frankenstein Cubase rig is rock solid.

-Chris

PS, I will be a charter member of the gear addicts help group when it gets going.

"Neve EQ will not solve the world's problems, Neve EQ will not solve the world's problems..." ;-)

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>Hey Chris,

>Great Post :).But, you have to agree that although PT HD/Mix systems are
>expensive, they deliver big time, with great i/o flexibility to integrate
>hardware. If you purchase or build the spec'd digi ssystem, then you are
assured

>maximun results. But, you'll pay for it \$\$\$\$\$:)

>LaMont

>

>

>"Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:

>>

>>It's already been said in other responses which I agree with. I don't
think

>>DSP DAWs are nescesary anymore, and I don't think it makes sense to try
>to

>>develop a competeing system to PT. Digi keeps the model going to keep
thier

>>stranglehold on a closed system that needs to be completely overhauled
(i.e.,

>>repurchased) every 4-5 years. I don't think that there is anything inherently

>>pro about DSP DAWs other than the perception. I agree that the cost of
>owning

>>a native system can approach a PT rig, but I think that is a matter of
paying

>>900% more to get a 2% performance increase. Gearsluttery is a bad disease

>>IMHO that get's in the way of truly getting the most out of what you already

>>have. And I still catch bad bouts of it myself ;-)

>>

>>-Chris

>>

>>"LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>>

>>>Good Points Chris:) Still, my initial point was concerning about the lack

>>>of mid-level pro DSP based DAWs. Digi's answer to my question (HD2 Axcel/
>>>with Control 24..Slew of plugs) 25k..!! I know this setup works well,but

>>>we are talking about 25k :) Surely, there must be a manufacturer that
can

>>>deliver a simular product for less?? LaMont

>>>

>>>

>>>"Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>"Lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>>>>>Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>very
>>>>>expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>
>>>>>But you don't have to play it. Do you change the way you work every
two
>>>>>years, or does the percieved need change? Did you need 64 tracks of
audio
>>>>>last year and all of a sudden need 96 tracks? Is the new uberhog reverb
>>>>>really that much better that you need a new computer every two years?
>>>>>
>>>>>I used to be caught up in the speed race myself. Upgrading from a 800
>>MHz
>>>>>processor, to a 900, to a 1200, etc. It all seems pretty silly now.

>I
>>>stopped
>>>>at an Athlon XP1400+ and life has been sweet ever since. I get the 24
>>tracks
>>>>>of 24/44.1 audio and 7-8 plugs that I need. My computer hasn't crashed
>>>in
>>>>>over 3 years. When I was running Paris, I had problems on a daily basis.
>>>> Life has been productive and sweet since going native.
>>>>>
>>>>>-Chris
>>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 05:08:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching mixer from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.

One of these wouldn't be bad either:

http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m c.htm

Or maybe,

<http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>

That's Nuendo on screen in both links.

This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:

<http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>

BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with a 64 bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the tool palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear, but that's more optimism than guarantee.

I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit (assuming Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept, but I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.

Regards,
Dedric

On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1 @linux, "Deej"
<hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:

>
> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was using
> Nuendo and had the budget.
>
> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>
> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a moose
> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's for
> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box, I might
> be convinced to jump ship.
>
> ;o)
>
>
>
> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need what
>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>> discussion)."
>>
>> Agreed.. :)

>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
> of
>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so ago. They
>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all is that
>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the
>> non-computer
>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology, that
>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed
>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out having
>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've been
> on
>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working system
>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped game.
>> I've lost decnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems were
>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and OS..
>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9 that's
>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable stable
>> stable:)
>>
>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s to
>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces due
>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
>> conversations
>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT Radar
>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a solid
> working
>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the client..
>>
>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated dsp system
>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China (Phonic
>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>> LaMont
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>
>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>> very
>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>
>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less

>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end a
>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and an
>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.
>>>
>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>
>>> discussion).
>>>
>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>
>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>> computer-based systems.
>>>
>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of the
>>
>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>
>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>
>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along the
>>
>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and it
>>> was a noticeable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just
>
>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>
>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,
>>
>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>
>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP for
>>
>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>
>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>

>>> much covered it.
>>>
>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>
>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid system.
>>>
>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software and
>>
>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>
>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>
>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>
>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM and
>
>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some third
>>
>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>
>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under 10K.
>>
>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may vary.
>>>
>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need to
>
>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
>>> slowing me down.
>>>
>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
>
>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra cost.
>>>
>>>
>>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the native
>> cpu
>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>
>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited DSP
>>
>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years, the
>>
>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
>>
>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>

>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>
>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>
>>>
>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>> environment..
>>>
>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through Logic
>>
>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>
>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software. If I
>>
>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>
>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can get
>
>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part of
>>
>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to the
>>
>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>
>>>
>>> The sad truth with most if not all native solutions is that
>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, in which native users
>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>> converters..All
>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
>> does
>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they
> could've
>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>
>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers to
>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>
>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>
>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.

>>>
>>>
>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can with
>> hesitation,
>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and truth
>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be
>>>> desired..
>>>
>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving
>>
>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>
>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really
>>
>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>
>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Take care,
>>>> Lamont
>>>> take care
>>>>
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs are
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>>
>>>>> faster?
>>>>>
>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money
>>
>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>
>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five year

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>
>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>>
>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.
>>>>>
>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into more
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>
>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go with
>>
>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of PPC
>>
>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which has
>>
>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>
>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
> has
>>>>
>>>> no
>>>>
>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>>>>
>>>> &
>>>>
>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield
>> pro
>>>>>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other

>>>>
>>>> than
>>>>
>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>
>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
>>>>
>>>> served
>>>>
>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
> revolutionary.
>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>
>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your
> only
>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that
>> naitive's
>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>>>>
>>>> more,
>>>>
>>>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to
>>>>
>>>> Pro
>>>>
>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come
> to
>>>>
>>>> an
>>>>
>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap
>> between
>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>
>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
> capability
>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
> found
>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>>>>
>>>> This
>>>>
>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their

>>>>
>>>> SX-1
>>>>
>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>> product
>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very
> cool
>>>>>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
>>>>
>>>> DAW,
>>>>
>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
>> faster
>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>> already..I
>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearsutz.com
>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>>
>>>> up
>>>>
>>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orginal
>>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
>>>>
>>>> sink
>>>>
>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is
> it
>>>>
>>>> that
>>>>
>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
> jsut
>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
>> is
>>>>
>>>> ,
>>>>
>>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for
>> HD..

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
> software
>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not
>> even
>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
>>>>
>>>> them,
>>>>
>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..) Sorry.
>>>>>
>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>>>>
>>>> of
>>>>
>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
>>>>
>>>> current
>>>>
>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
>>>>
>>>> 3-15k
>>>>
>>>>> would do it..
>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 05:20:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Great Points again!! "Neve EQ will not solve the world's problems, Neve EQ
will not solve the
world's problems..." ;-)"
Lol!!!!

To be honest Chris, my PAris problems were attributed to trying to stay up
with BrianT's contant upgrading.(God Bless his genius).:)

Before all this XP & Paris integration, Win 98seME was solid as a rock for
me on a PC that I made.. I mean 1-20 hours work days, no problems. This PC
never seen the light of the Internet, just a Paris PC, that's all. BUT,

it's when I got on the MOBO,CPU,video, Chip-set, XP/Paris upgrade path, things got out of wack and less stable. That's when I started using Nuendo more and more, but did not care for the sonics like I Paris.

"Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:

>
>LaMont, I agree that a PT system delivers the goods. But you have to admit
>that they have less flexibility than a native system, no? Is it your experience
>that you can't get equal performance out of a native system? In terms of
>track count/plugs or stability?
>
>I see your point that Digi designs and tests complete systems. If you follow
>their lead, you are working with a system where all the hardware and drivers
>play nicely together on a computer that has been run through the paces in
>terms of chipset compatibility and processing power. However, you can (at
>least in theory) get that from VAR companies like Chatillon, ADK, Wave Digital,
>et al, who will build you a "Nuendo Computer" with known good hardware and
>support the entire system. A system like this will still cost much less
>than any Digi rig and IMHO will likely be equally reliable. Crashes still
>happen on a digi-approved rig.
>
>If there were another DSP system maker to enter the market, there is nothing
>to say that they would even venture into total system integration. Ensoniq/Emu
>never made any chipset/mobo/videocard suggestions, which caused more than
>a few of us here a lot of grief. If weren't for this newsgroup, I would
>have bailed on Paris much sooner. I don't run a commercial studio anymore,
>but when I did, I was using Paris. I had a lot of problems with my system,
>through a few different host computer iterations. There were many times
>I had to shut a session down due to technical issues. I guess this is at
>the root of why I don't think that a DSP package system is any more pro
than
>a native system built up with hardware from several manufacturers. My frankenstein
>Cubase rig is rock solid.
>
>-Chris
>
>PS, I will be a charter member of the gear addicts help group when it gets
>going.
>"Neve EQ will not solve the world's problems, Neve EQ will not solve the
>world's problems..." ;-)
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Hey Chris,
>>Great Post :)..But, you have to agree that although PT HD/Mix systems are

>>expensive, they deliver big time, with great i/o flexibility to integrate
>>hardware. If you purchase or build the spec'd digi ssystem, then you are
>assured
>>maximun results. But, you'll pay for it \$\$\$\$\$:)
>>LaMont
>>
>>
>>"Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:
>>>
>>>It's already been said in other responses which I agree with. I don't
>think
>>>DSP DAWs are nescesary anymore, and I don't think it makes sense to try
>>to
>>>develop a competeing system to PT. Digi keeps the model going to keep
>thier
>>>stranglehold on a closed system that needs to be completely overhauled
>(i.e.,
>>>repurchased) every 4-5 years. I don't think that there is anything inherently
>>>pro about DSP DAWs other than the perception. I agree that the cost of
>>owning
>>>a native system can approach a PT rig, but I think that is a matter of
>paying
>>>900% more to get a 2% performance increase. Gearsluttery is a bad disease
>>>IMHO that get's in the way of truly getting the most out of what you already
>>>have. And I still catch bad bouts of it myself ;-)
>>>
>>>-Chris
>>>
>>>"LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Good Points Chris:) Still, my initial point was concerning about the
>lack
>>>>of mid-level pro DSP based DAWs. Digi's answer to my question (HD2 Axcel/
>>>>with Control 24..Slew of plugs) 25k..!! I know this setup works well,but
>>>>we are talking about 25k :) Surely, there must be a manufacturer that
>can
>>>>deliver a simular product for less?? LaMont
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"Chris Wargo" <na@na.na> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>"Lamont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off
>cheap.
>>>>>>Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>very
>>>>>>expensive.. think about it..??

>>>>
>>>>>But you don't have to play it. Do you change the way you work every
>two
>>>>>years, or does the perceived need change? Did you need 64 tracks of
>audio
>>>>>last year and all of a sudden need 96 tracks? Is the new uberhog reverb
>>>>>really that much better that you need a new computer every two years?
>>>>>
>>>>>I used to be caught up in the speed race myself. Upgrading from a 800
>>>MHz
>>>>>processor, to a 900, to a 1200, etc. It all seems pretty silly now.
>
>>I
>>>>>stopped
>>>>>at an Athlon XP1400+ and life has been sweet ever since. I get the
24
>>>tracks
>>>>>of 24/44.1 audio and 7-8 plugs that I need. My computer hasn't crashed
>>>>in
>>>>>over 3 years. When I was running Paris, I had problems on a daily basis.
>>>>> Life has been productive and sweet since going native.
>>>>>
>>>>>-Chris
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 05:30:39 GMT

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

Good points Dedric :)
"(never liked the editing workflow either - something
about it seems archaic, a la Avid, rather than intuitive)."

I agree with here. There is nothing that compares to Nuendo's/SX editing.
When I'm working in Nuendo, I have to admit that I smile, when it's editing
time. They(Steinberg) really put's the "I" in "intuitive". Easy, yet very
powerful..My favorite editor for any project. PT is kinda wiered and archaic.
Their "smart" tool is confusing at first, nothing like Paris, which has to
be one the fastest smoothest editors ever.But, I have to admit, once you
knwo hoe PT's editing is done, it's very powerfull! indeed..

I pray and hope that your are right about the future of VST. We sure can
use a shot in that direction..Take care.LaMont

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>To me having to switch between apps for midi or audio is a limitation I'm
>trying to get away from - having both together greatly increases my
>productivity and creativity, so that's the draw with Nuendo, and significant
>negative for ProTools (never liked the editing workflow either - something
>about it seems archaic, a la Avid, rather than intuitive).

>

>Spec'ing and building DAW systems is no big deal for me, as I am sure for
>you and most people here, so maybe we are in the minority. Sure, the time
>spent doing so gets to be a drag - I'm with you there, but it's worth it

to

>me and my company. Upgrading a ProTools rig for similar functionality would
>cost me many times more - just doesn't make sense unless money is of little
>concern.

>

>As far as managing I/O - I agree that is a limitation with native rigs due
>to the layer of ASIO and external I/O hardware in terms of simplicity -
>functionality is there. Getting around Totalmix routing, for example, on
>top of Nuendo routing, and still not having a simple solution for
>push-button rerouting can be a pain, but once a system is set, it can be
>workable.

>

>Nuendo's control room in 3.2 is a big step in the right direction (sure
made
>my life easier), and apparently that is only part of the story yet to unfold
>with Nuendo. Steinberg's goal, I believe, is for Nuendo to be the control
>center for any size studio's full routing and monitoring functionality -
>with or without a console (e.g. direct Euphonix and SSL integration, or
>standalone). For sure ProTools has a very effective routing approach,
even

>if a bit in-elegant and tech-geekish in implementation, but you do pay a
>premium to get gear that all has the same logo.

>

>I think we'll see very well integrated, complete systems with other DAW
>software in the not too distant future. VST 3.0, if it ever gets released,
>will likely help. Nuendo 4.0 could also tilt the scales if I'm guessing
>right about studio implementation, but that remains to be seen.

>

>If you really want a mid-level dsp-based DAW, I think Pyramix and Soundscape
>are your only options currently, but I don't like the limited plugin and
3rd

>party support by either. At least they do fit the bill of being integrated
>solutions from one manufacturer. I had considered getting an I/O box from
>Soundscape/Sydec to use with Nuendo, but lost interest when I realized I
>would have to use their mixer - e.g. Back to the joy of routing between

DAWs

>just to get one plugin in the chain. Not a time saver for me, so that makes
>it a deal breaker.

>

>Regards,

>Dedric

>

>On 1/15/06 8:51 PM, in article 43cb0a4b\$1@linux, "LaMont"

><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>>

>> Hey Dedric,

>>

>> First, I just completed mixing an entire album usnig Nuendo/RME. The clients
>> like it very much. So, I knwoo how to make Nuendo work.. To me , Neundo/SX
>> makes you work harder for projects over 50 tracks in R & B music.

>>

>> Much easier to mix in Paris & Pro Tools. And, there is a difference in
sound..

>>

>> My interpretation as "Pro" DAW, starts a "total System Package". Meaning
>> software 7 Hardware from a given manufacturer that will allow limitless
i/o,

>> patchbay functionality.

>>

>> I'm not saying that Nuendo is not a Pro Product,it is, just liek Logic
Audio,

>> DP, Sonar,Samplitude, SX,Vegas..I own all execpt, samplitude & sonar,
and

>> I get great results from each.

>>

>> However, do I feel that without some fader package, upgraded onverters,
off

>> shelf DSP cards, the experience and workflow suffers greatly.

>>

>> My origanl post was only to point out that since Paris demise, no other
>> manufacture

>> has brought to market a "Total Solution" package for the mid ground. Yes
>> we have the software like Nuendo, but, what about matching some hardware
>> with it, and a SPec'd system (Mac/PC) that's sold as a Package.

>>

>> Now we only have LE, and all the naitives. You'releft to piece-mill a
package

>> yourself. But, It's been my experience as a DAW consultant/Builder, that
>> wayy too much time is spent on specing and little time working..

>>

>> Say what you want about about Digi, they sell a package. note: Most studio
>> are still running the old PT Mix system. hey, it works with just a Mac

G4

>> of some kind.. So, you don't have to upgrade to HD.. But, Hey their new mixer

>> controllers are terrific!! but expensive :) Still, they have a system that

>> works well if you follow their specs to the letter.

>>

>> Again, I'm not saying that my Nuendo setup is not stable ,it is. It (Nuendo)

>> shuts down only when I'm done working in it. That's saying a lot about

>> the Software.. But, VSt2 as it stands today, is very clumsy in handling i/o

>> integration. Now, to some bigtime Nuendo users who have an SSL, Trident

>> console front-ending their rig, then it's a moot point, but to those who

are

>> mixing ITB, it's a major pain..

>> LaMont

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> rry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>> Hi Lamont,

>>>

>>>> The reason I don't consider nuendo/sx as pro is because, it's only

>>>> software..

>>>

>>> That in fact proves my point - "pro" has become much more of a personal

>>> perception driven by marketing and peer pressure than the actual definition.

>>> For example in another industry, to some video houses, a \$50,000 Avid rig

>>> may not be pro compared to a \$200,000 Quantel system, but both will do much

>>> the same thing - deliver professional results - with differences that may

>> be

>>> key for the specific user (broadcast vs. post, etc), but not the definition

>>> of "pro" in general.

>>>

>>> Saying software isn't "pro" is missing the point of being a pro. Pro

is

>>> about getting paid for what you do because you deliver quality results and

>>> products that someone else is willing to pay for. In another post you said

>>> that Chinese products offer an astounding value for the money. To me that's

>>> a rather astounding paradox to your definition. They are a good

>>> cost/performance ratio, but it is contradictory to say that Nuendo isn't
>> pro
>>> and a C1 mic is, in the same breath. I haven't heard a Chinese mic that
>>> compared to what I would consider, and choose as a "pro" mic (whether
higher
>>> end "pro" from Lawson, Blue or Neumann, or a mid-grade Audio Technica).
>>>
>>> Yes, it takes converters, etc, to augment Nuendo for use in various
>>> situations, but the same is true of ProTools (ProTools isn't much good
>>> without an I/O box). Just because Digi sells it as one package doesn't
>> make
>>> it pro. And you have an expensive upgrade path - much more than upgrade
>> PCs
>>> every couple of years. I've done the math on this many times (including
>>> comparing UAD-1 cards to the TDM equivalents in terms of plugin counts
per
>>> dollar - UAD-1 cards win easily).
>>>
>>> I use my Nuendo rig and many other software, and hardware tools day in
and
>>> day out producing media for a variety of professional clients in a very
>>> professional setting. We have office/studio space in the world headquarters
>>> for one of our main clients. Should I tell them that since I don't have
>>> ProTools and a Euphonix or Neve console (yet) to make it look bigger
and
>>> costs them more than it needs to does that make us less pro? No. Attitude
>>> and quality product delivery are what make us pro. Maybe Nuendo doesn't
>>> work for you, aor maybe you haven't decided to make it work for you,
but
>> it
>>> does work for a lot of other "professionals" like myself.
>>>
>>> Manufacturers and marketing departments define the line between Pro and
>>> Consumer when they add one feature or part that costs more than they
believe
>>> they can sell to the average consumer, so they almost haphazardly label
>> it
>>> "Pro" and double the price. We then blindly adopt that as the "pro"
>>> standard and thumb our noses at consumer gear.
>>>
>>> It really irritates me when people arrogantly define pro as what they,
or
>>> someone else has based on how expensive (e.g. Over a randomly chosen
>>> pricepoint) and popular it is, and non-pro as anything that isn't all
of
>> the
>>> above. That just isn't fair, objective, or pro in my book.
>>>

>>> It is sad that the media and arts production industry has increasingly
come
>>> to define the word "pro" by how much it costs to buy rather than the
quality
>>> of the product. Anyone ever see "Gigli" or heard of Britney Spears?
|
>> rest
>>> my case. ;-)
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedic
>>> Echo Media Group, LLC
>>>
>>> On 1/15/06 11:22 AM, in article 43ca84bf\$1@linux, "Lamont"
>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> Hey Dedic,
>>>>
>>>> The reason I dont consider nuendo/sx as pro is beacause, it's only
>>>> software..To
>>>> get that and any native base app to pro standards in a day/out studio
>>>> situation
>>>> will cost you: Control surface unit, good converters, monitoring/talk
>> back
>>>> unit, and lets not forget the blazing cpu thatsd needed for low-latency,
>>>> big toime plugins..
>>>>
>>>> I'm not saying, that pro can't use natives, we do..It;s just like BrianT's
>>>> nuendo system(s)..He manning his nuendo systems using theEuphonics system
>>>> 5 system..can we say, that will and does take his system to a new level??
>>>> But, we all know, thtats what BT demands from a system..
>>>> mt point in the post was not ask a question "where is the development
>> for
>>>> the 5-10k crowd?? Sure digi is covering the high end, with their new
mixer
>>>> controllers both offering great monitoring ,talkback, and tight software
>>>> integration..I ca'nt believe that in the year 2006, no manufacture can
>> com
>>>> out with a cheaper solution than digi??...
>>>> takecare..
>>>> lamont
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> dric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> A curiosity question - why do you not consider Nuendo, Logic etc, "pro

>>>> DAWs"? Let's look back a bit - DAWs of any nature weren't considered
>> "pro"
>>>> when first offering an alternative to tape and a \$500,000 console.
>>>> Technology advances, ProTools becomes more and more popular, and the
>> name
>>>> sticks - it's now "pro". Then Paris, which was not considered pro
when
>>>> Ensoniq first launched it, caught on in a small community and by Paris
>>>> users, it is considered "pro". Just a semantics question perhaps,
but
>> it
>>>> does make me wonder if each market that finds the tool they like, considers
>>>> it "pro" because it works for them. I know of no standard to define
>> the
>>>> term outside of what that tool does for one's income.
>>>>
>>>> Anyway, other dedicated dsp systems: Pyramix (www.merging.com). Soundscape
>>>> - still popular in Europe I believe (<http://www.sydec.be/>).
>>>>
>>>> I think as others are pointing out, the cost and risk of developing
>>>> dedicated dsp is the real issue - faster computers are making the concept
>>>> obsolete to a large market of users, at least for the most part.
>>>>
>>>> In the video world, streaming full resolution, uncompressed HD video
>> still
>>>> requires dedicated processing for high speed work (Blackmagic, Canopus,
>>>> Avid
>>>> cards, etc), and production houses that require full realtime effects
>>>> require it (render times not acceptable - e.g. Broadcast, networks
where
>>>> deadlines are very tight, large commercial production houses, etc -
many
>>>> use
>>>> high end \$100k+ systems for that, with no more effects or editing
>>>> capability
>>>> than Final Cut Pro, Vegas or Avid Express, but eliminating render times).
>>>>
>>>> However, even that market is changing, granted from the small production
>>>> house up, not yet in the broadcast world. The limitations of native
>> there
>>>> are how well a native system can support full resolution high quality
>> video
>>>> (cpu/disk load, speed, etc), not the actual editing software's
>>>> functionality
>>>> or "professional" image. So in audio, if one can stream 100 tracks
of
>> audio
>>>> with full, quality processing and effects, including outboard (more

than
>>>> I
>>>>> could do with my Paris rig), and it earns 100% of one's income, is
that
>>>> not
>>>>> "pro"? It's more than I was doing in studios with 2" tape and only
24
>>>>> tracks to work with. :-)
>>>>>
>>>>> Committing to dedicated DSP is costly and very likely (these days)
a
>> short
>>>>> term investment - that's why no one has jumped in to do it. Mark my
>> words,
>>>>> Digidesign is building their native holdings for a reason. Eventually
>> they
>>>>> too will be offering a dual/quad quad core native system with 64-bit
>>>>> processing and as much power as and HD3 rig. They've already made
an
>> old
>>>>> technology (motorola dsp) hang on for years after it has been superceded
>>>> by
>>>>> better dsp solutions (custom asic, or even video graphics chips - UAD,
>> and
>>>>> whatever the new generic dsp system is - can't recall the name).
>>>>>
>>>>> Just my .02
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Detric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 1/15/06 1:31 AM, in article 43c9fa54\$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>> has
>>>> no
>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>>>>> &
>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield
>> pro
>>>>>>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture
other

>>>> than
>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>
>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
>>>> served
>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
>>>>> revolutionary.
>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>
>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your
>> only
>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that
>>>>> naitive's
>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>>>> more,
>>>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up
to
>>>> Pro
>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come
>> to
>>>> an
>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap
>> between
>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>
>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
>>>>> capability
>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
>> found
>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>>>> This
>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
>>>> SX-1
>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
product
>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very
>> cool
>>>>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>
>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based

>>>> DAW,
>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
>> faster
>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>>> already..I
>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>> again..)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>> up
>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
Original
>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if
they
>>>> sink
>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is
>> it
>>>> that
>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
>> jsut
>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
>> is
>>>> ,
>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for
>> HD..
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
>> software
>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not
>> even
>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
>>>> them,
>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..) Sorry.
>>>>>
>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>>>> of
>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than
your
>>>> current
>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along
say
>>>> 3-15k
>>>>> would do it..

>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Deej](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 05:45:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was using Nuendo and had the budget.

<http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>

A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a moose of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's for tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box, I might be convinced to jump ship.

;o)

"LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
>"Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need what
>I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this discussion)."
>
>Agreed.. :)
>But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
of
>mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so ago. They
>are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all is that
>we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the non-computer
>music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology, that
>they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed
>that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out having
>to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've been
on
>that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working system
>setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped game.
>I've lost decnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems were
>not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and OS..
>I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9 that's

>rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable stable
>stable:)
>
>2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s to
>Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces due
>to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our conversations
>about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT Radar
>with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a solid
working
>system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the client..
>
>Dedric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated dsp system
>manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China (Phonic
>firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>LaMont
>
>
>
>
>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>Lamont wrote:
>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>
>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.
>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>very
>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>
>>Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end a
>>Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and an
>>inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.
>>
>>Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>(what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>
>>discussion).
>>
>>There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>
>>available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>computer-based systems.

>>
>>Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of the
>
>>advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>
>>PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>
>>I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along the
>
>>way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and it
>>was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just

>>as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>
>>PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
>>freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,
>
>>but forever short. So I sold it.
>>
>>Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP for
>
>>the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>
>>The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty

>>much covered it.
>>
>>I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>
>>to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid system.
>>
>>After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software and
>
>>i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer

>>OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>
>>If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac

>>or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM and

>>HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some third
>
>>party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.

>>Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under 10K.
>
>>Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may vary.
>>
>>My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need to

>>upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
>>slowing me down.
>>
>>However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video

>>production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra cost.
>>
>>
>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the native
>cpu
>>> is a secondary issue.
>>
>>With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited DSP
>
>>system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years, the
>
>>cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
>
>>a newer, faster computer.
>>
>>And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything

>>that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>
>>
>>Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>> enviornment..
>>
>>This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through Logic
>
>>the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>
>>The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW

>>software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software. If I
>
>>need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>
>>I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can get

>>moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part of
>
>>the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to the
>
>>precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>
>>
>>The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native users
>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average converters..All
>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
>does
>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they
could've
>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>
>>A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers to
>>choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
>>under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>
>>Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools

>>system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>
>>
>>> Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, Ican with
>hesitation,
>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and truth
>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be desired..
>>
>>A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
>>Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving
>
>>fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>
>>It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really
>
>>saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>
>>OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long

>>enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>>with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>> Take care,
>>> Lamont
>>> take care
>>>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs are
>>>
>>>
>>>>so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>
>>>>faster?
>>>>
>>>>The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money
>
>>>>on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>>>There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>
>>>>It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five year
>>>
>>>
>>>>wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software

>>>>choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>
>>>>starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.
>>>>
>>>>Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into more
>>>
>>>
>>>>laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>
>>>>The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go with
>
>>>>Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>
>>>>If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of PPC
>

>>>>choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which has
>
>>>>more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>
>>>>to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>
>>>>>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
has
>>>
>>> no
>>>
>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>
>>>>>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>>>
>>> &
>>>
>>>>>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield
>pro
>>>>>results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other
>>>
>>> than
>>>
>>>>>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>>>>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>>>>>
>>>>>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
>>>
>>> served
>>>
>>>>>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
revolutionary.
>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>
>>>>>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your
only
>>>>>other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that
>naitive's
>>>>>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even

>>>
>>> more,
>>>
>>>>it's a known fact that, if you were to build your native system up to
>>>
>>> Pro
>>>
>>>>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come
to
>>>
>>> an
>>>
>>>>PT HD system.
>>>>There has to be a manufacturer that will stand up and fill in the gap
>between
>>>>PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>
>>>>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>-The Mackie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
capability
>>>>to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
found
>>>>in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>>to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>>>
>>> This
>>>
>>>>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
>>>
>>> SX-1
>>>
>>>>was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>>>>first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a very
cool
>>>>DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>
>>>>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
>>>
>>> DAW,
>>>
>>>>we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
>faster
>>>>Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>already..I
>>>>say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)
>>>>
>>>>

>>>>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>>about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>>I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>
>>> up
>>>
>>>>a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orginal
>>>>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
>>>
>>> sink
>>>
>>>>another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>>>>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is
it
>>>
>>> that
>>>
>>>>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
jsut
>>>>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
>is
>>>
>>> ,
>>>
>>>>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for
>HD..
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
software
>>>>support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not
>even
>>>>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were
>>>
>>> them,
>>>
>>>>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
>>>>
>>>>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>>>
>>> of
>>>
>>>>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
>>>
>>> current
>>>
>>>>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
>>>

>>> 3-15k
>>>
>>>>>would do it..
>>>>>Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>
>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 06:04:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

La Mont,

I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on a native system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets big again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and then tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here. I'm using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O in my cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and EQ's. In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For a while I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I don't even think twice.

Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.

[http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Love/)

It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and a little de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks, vocal track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the mix.....and what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearness that I hear in PT, but we were going after a retro feel and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to do with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if I sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*, though NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.

Deej

..

"LaMont" <jjdp@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:43cb2d79\$1@linux...

>

> hey Detric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the difference
> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
version
> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they did
> soemthing.
>
> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit floating
> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down the
> audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain point.
> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track counts.
> LaMont
>
> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
> >ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching mixer
> >from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
> >are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
> >
> >One of these wouldn't be bad either:
> >
> > http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m.c.htm
> >
> >Or maybe,
> >
> ><http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
> >
> >That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
> >
> >This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
> >
> ><http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
> >
> >
> >BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with a
> >64
> >bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
> >tool
> >palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear, but
> >that's more optimism than guarantee.
> >
> >
> >I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit

(assuming
> >Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
but
> >I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
> >
> >Regards,
> >Dedric
> >
> >On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1 @linux, "Deej"
> ><hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzzz> wrote:
> >
> >>
> >> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
using
> >> Nuendo and had the budget.
> >>
> >> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
> >>
> >> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a
moose
> >> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
> for
> >> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box, I
> might
> >> be convinced to jump ship.
> >>
> >> ;o)
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
> >>>
> >>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
> what
> >>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
> >>> discussion)."
> >>>
> >>> Agreed.. :)
> >>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer
buddies
> >> of
> >>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so ago.
> They
> >>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all is
> that
> >>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the
> >>> non-computer
> >>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,

> that
> >>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
agreed
> >>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out
> having
> >>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "treadmill" if you will. I've
been
> >> on
> >>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
> system
> >>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
game.
> >>> I've lost decnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems
> were
> >>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
OS..
> >>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9
> that's
> >>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
> stable
> >>> stable:)
> >>>
> >>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s
> to
> >>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
> due
> >>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
> >>> conversations
> >>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
> Radar
> >>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a
solid
> >> working
> >>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the
client..
> >>>
> >>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated dsp
> system
> >>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
> (Phonic
> >>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are
astounding
> >>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
> >>> LaMont
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>

> >>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>> Lamont wrote:
> >>>>> Hey Jaimie,
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off
> >>>>> cheap.
> >>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not
> >>>>> productive..2)
> >>> very
> >>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
> >>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end
> >>>>> a
> >>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and an
> >>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
> >>>>> \$1000.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
> >>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of
> >>>>> this
> >>>>>
> >>>>> discussion).
> >>>>>
> >>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
> >>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
> >>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
> >>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle,
> >>>>> they're
> >>>>>
> >>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
> >>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
> >>>>> computer-based systems.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of
> >>>>> the
> >>>>>
> >>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
> >>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based
> >>>>> systems.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
> >>>>> the
> >>>>>
> >>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and it

> >>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
> >>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
> >>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
just
> >>
> >>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
> >>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
> >>>>
> >>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
> >>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
Close,
> >>>
> >>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
> >>>>
> >>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
> for
> >>>>
> >>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
> >>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
> >>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating
system.
> >>>>
> >>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS
pretty
> >>
> >>>> much covered it.
> >>>>
> >>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the
transition
> >>>>
> >>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
> system.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
> and
> >>>>>
> >>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
> >>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and
computer
> >>
> >>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
> >>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad
PowerMac
> >>
> >>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
and

> >>
> >>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some third
> >>>
> >>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
> >>
> >>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under > 10K.
> >>>
> >>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may > vary.
> >>>>
> >>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need > to
> >>
> >>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with > >>>> slowing me down.
> >>>>
> >>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
> >>
> >>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra > cost.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the native
> >>> cpu
> >>>>> is a secondary issue.
> >>>>
> >>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited > DSP
> >>>>
> >>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years, > the
> >>>>
> >>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
> >>>>
> >>>>> a newer, faster computer.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
> >>
> >>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
> >>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
> >>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.

> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
> >>>>> enviornment..
> >>>>
> >>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
> >>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
Logic
> >>>>
> >>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
> >>>>
> >>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
> >>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
> >>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software. If
> I
> >>>>
> >>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
> >>>>
> >>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
get
> >>>>
> >>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
> >>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
> of
> >>>>
> >>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to
> the
> >>>>
> >>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
> >>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
> users
> >>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
> >>>>> converters..All
> >>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
person
> >>>> does
> >>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they
> >> could've
> >>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers to
> >>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
> >>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a

ProTools

> >>

> >>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.

> >>>>

> >>>>

> >>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can with

> >>> hesitation,

> >>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and

> truth

> >>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be

> >>>>> desired..

> >>>>

> >>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU

> >>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24

moving

> >>>>

> >>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.

> >>>>

> >>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really

> >>>>

> >>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm

> >>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.

> >>>>

> >>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long

> >>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even

> >>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.

> >>>>

> >>>> Cheers,

> >>>> -Jamie

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

> >>>>

> >>>>

> >>>>

> >>>>

> >>>>> Take care,

> >>>>> Lamont

> >>>>> take care

> >>>>>

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

> >>>>>

> >>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs

> are

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting

> >>>
> >>>>> faster?
> >>>>>
> >>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money
> >>>
> >>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
> >>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
> >>>>>
> >>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five
> year
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
> >>
> >>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
> >>>
> >>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
> more
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
> >>>
> >>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go
> with
> >>>
> >>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of
> PPC
> >>>
> >>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
> has
> >>>
> >>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
> >>>
> >>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> LaMont wrote:
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris
DAW(\$2700list)there
> >> has
> >>>>>
> >>>>> no
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
DP(699)
> >>>>>
> >>>>> &
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will
yield
> >>> pro
> >>>>>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture
> other
> >>>>>
> >>>>> than
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost
> 6 years
> >>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
> >>>>>> Soundscape..
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product
> that
> >>>>>
> >>>>> served
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point
was
> >> revolutionary.
> >>>>>> AND That's the point..
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system,
your
> >> only
> >>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying
that
> >>> naitive's

> >>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP
DAW..Even
> >>>>>
> >>>>> more,
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> it's a known fact that, if you were to build your native system up
> to
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Pro
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually
come
> >> to
> >>>>>
> >>>>> an
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> PT HD system.
> >>>>>> There has to be a manufacturer that will stand up and fill in the
> gap
> >>> between
> >>>>>> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
> >>>>>> -The Mackie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had
the
> >> capability
> >>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool
editing
> >> found
> >>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the
capabilities
> >>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the
mixer.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> This
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it,
> their
> >>>>>
> >>>>> SX-1
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
> >>>>>> product
> >>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
> >>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a
very
> >> cool
> >>>>>> DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..

> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
> >>>>>
> >>>>> DAW,
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
> >>> faster
> >>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
> >>> already..I
> >>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
> >>>>>> again...:)
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
> >>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
> >>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
> >>>>>
> >>>>> up
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
> Orginal
> >>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if
> they
> >>>>>
> >>>>> sink
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
> >>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
> Is
> >> it
> >>>>>
> >>>>> that
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
> >> jsut
> >>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
> >>> is
> >>>>>
> >>>>> ,

> >>>>
> >>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up
> for
> >>> HD..
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS,
little
> >> software
> >>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm
> not
> >>> even
> >>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I
> were
> >>>>>
> >>>>> them,
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...)
Sorry.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast
market
> >>>>>
> >>>>> of
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than
> your
> >>>>>
> >>>>> current
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along
> say
> >>>>>
> >>>>> 3-15k
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> would do it..
> >>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 06:22:01 GMT

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

hey Detric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the difference form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will. version 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they did soemthing.

Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit floating point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down the audio bandwidth, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain point. 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track counts.
LaMont

Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching mixer
>from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.

>

>One of these wouldn't be bad either:

>

> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m.c.htm

>

>Or maybe,

>

><http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>

>

>That's Nuendo on screen in both links.

>

>This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:

>

><http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>

>

>

>BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with a 64

>bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the tool

>palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear, but

>that's more optimism than guarantee.

>

>I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit (assuming

>Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept, but

>I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.

>

>Regards,

>Detric

>

>On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"

><hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:

>
>>
>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was using
>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>
>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>
>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a moose
>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
for
>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box, I
might
>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>>
>>
>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
what
>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>> discussion)."
>>>
>>> Agreed.. :)
>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
>> of
>>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so ago.
They
>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all is
that
>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the
>>> non-computer
>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
that
>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed
>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out
having
>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've been
>> on
>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
system
>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped game.
>>> I've lost decnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems
were
>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and OS..
>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9

that's

>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable stable

>>> stable:)

>>>

>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s to

>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces due

>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our >>> conversations

>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT Radar

>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a solid >> working

>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the client.. >>>

>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated dsp system

>>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China (Phonic

>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding >>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?

>>> LaMont

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

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

>>>>

>>>> Lamont wrote:

>>>>> Hey Jaimie,

>>>>>

>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off cheap.

>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)

>>> very

>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??

>>>>>

>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less >>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end

a

>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and an

>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.

>>>>>

>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need

>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the roof of this

>>>
>>>> discussion).
>>>>
>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>>>
>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>
>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of
the
>>>>
>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>>>
>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>
>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
the
>>>>
>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and it
>>>> was a noticeable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just
>>>>
>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>
>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,
>>>>
>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>
>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
for
>>>>
>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>>>
>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>>>>
>>>> much covered it.
>>>>
>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition

>>>
>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid system.
>>>>
>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software and
>>>
>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>
>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>
>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>
>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM and
>>
>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some third
>>>
>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>
>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
10K.
>>>
>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may
vary.
>>>>
>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
to
>>
>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>
>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
>>
>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
cost.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the native
>>> cpu
>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>
>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
DSP
>>>
>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
the

>>>
>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
>>>
>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>
>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>
>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>> environment..
>>>>
>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through Logic
>>>
>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>
>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software. If
I
>>>
>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>
>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can get
>>
>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
of
>>>
>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to
the
>>>
>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> The sad truth with most if not all native solutions is that
>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, in which native
users
>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>> converters..All
>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
>>> does
>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they
>> could've

>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>
>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers to
>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>
>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>
>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can with
>>> hesitation,
>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and
truth
>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be
>>>>> desired..
>>>>
>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving
>>>
>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>
>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really
>>>
>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>
>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Take care,
>>>>> Lamont
>>>>> take care
>>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs
are
>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>>>
>>>>> faster?
>>>>>
>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more money
>>>
>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>
>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five
year
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>>
>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>>>
>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they say.
>>>>>
>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
more
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>>
>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go
with
>>>
>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of
PPC
>>>
>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
has
>>>
>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>>
>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>

>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>> has
>>>>>
>>>>> no
>>>>>
>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>>>>>
>>>>> &
>>>>>
>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield
>>> pro
>>>>>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture
other
>>>>>
>>>>> than
>>>>>
>>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost
6 years
>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product
that
>>>>>
>>>>> served
>>>>>
>>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was
>> revolutionary.
>>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your
>> only
>>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that
>>> naitive's
>>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>>>>>
>>>>> more,
>>>>>
>>>>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up
to
>>>>>
>>>>> Pro
>>>>>
>>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come

>> to
>>>>>
>>>>> an
>>>>>
>>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the
gap
>>> between
>>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the
>> capability
>>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
>> found
>>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
>>>>>
>>>>> This
>>>>>
>>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it,
their
>>>>>
>>>>> SX-1
>>>>>
>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>> product
>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very
>> cool
>>>>>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based
>>>>>
>>>>> DAW,
>>>>>
>>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
>>> faster
>>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>> already..I
>>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>>> again...)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>>>

>>>> up
>>>>
>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
Original
>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if
they
>>>>
>>>> sink
>>>>
>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
Is
>> it
>>>>
>>>> that
>>>>
>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
>> jsut
>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean
>>> is
>>>>
>>>> ,
>>>>
>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up
for
>>> HD..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
>> software
>>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm
not
>>> even
>>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I
were
>>>>
>>>> them,
>>>>
>>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...:) Sorry.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>>>>
>>>> of
>>>>
>>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than
your
>>>>
>>>> current

>>>>>
>>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along
say
>>>>>
>>>>> 3-15k
>>>>>
>>>>>> would do it..
>>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Deej](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 07:10:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

La Mont,

I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on a native system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets big again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and then tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here. I'm using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O in my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and EQ's. In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For a while I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I don't even think twice.

Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.

[http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Love/)

It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and a little de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks, vocal track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the mix.....and what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity and accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro feel and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to do with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if I sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*, though

NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.

Deej

"LaMont" <jjdpo@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
>hey Dedic, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the difference
>form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will. version
>5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they
did
>soemthing.

>
>Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit floating
>point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down
the
>audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain point.
>32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track counts.
>LaMont

>
>Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching mixer
>>from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>>are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.

>>
>>One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>
>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m.c.htm

>>
>>Or maybe,
>>
>><http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>

>>
>>That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>
>>This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:

>>
>><http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>

>>
>>
>>BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with

a
>64
>>bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the tool
>>palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear, but
>>that's more optimism than guarantee.

>>
>>I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit (assuming

>>Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
but
>>I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>
>>Regards,
>>Dedric
>>
>>On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>><hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
>>> using
>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>
>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>
>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a moose
>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>for
>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>
>might
>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>
>>> ;o)
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>what
>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>> discussion)."
>>>>
>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
>>> of
>>>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so ago.
>They
>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>is
>that
>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the
>>>> non-computer
>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>that

>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed
>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out
>having
>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've been
>>>> on
>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>system
>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
game.
>>>> I've lost deconet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems
>were
>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
OS..
>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9
>that's
>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>stable
>>>> stable:)
>>>>
>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s
>to
>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>due
>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
>>>> conversations
>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>Radar
>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a solid
>>> working
>>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the client..
>>>>
>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated dsp
>system
>>>> maybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>(Phonic
>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>> LaMont
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off

>cheap.
>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>> very
>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>
>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end
>a
>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and
an
>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.
>>>>>
>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of
>this
>>>>>
>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>
>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>>>>
>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>
>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of
>the
>>>>>
>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>>>>
>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>
>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>the
>>>>>
>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
it
>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just
>>>>>
>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>
>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the

>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,
>>>>
>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>
>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
>for
>>>>
>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>>>
>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>>>
>>>> much covered it.
>>>>
>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>>>
>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>system.
>>>>
>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>and
>>>>
>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>
>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>
>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>>
>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
and
>>>
>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
third
>>>>
>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>>
>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>10K.
>>>>
>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may
>vary.
>>>>
>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
>to
>>>

>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>
>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
>>>
>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>cost.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the native
>>>> cpu
>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>
>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>DSP
>>>>
>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>the
>>>>
>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
>>>>
>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>
>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>
>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>> enviorment..
>>>>>
>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
Logic
>>>>
>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>
>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
If
>I
>>>>
>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>
>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can

get
>>>
>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
>of
>>>>>
>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to
>the
>>>>>
>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>users
>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
>>>> does
>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they
>>> could've
>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>
>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>to
>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>
>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>
>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>with
>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and
>truth
>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be
>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>
>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving
>>>>
>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>
>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really
>>>>

>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>
>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs
>are
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>>>>
>>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
money
>>>>
>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five
>year
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>>>>
>>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>>>>
>>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
say.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
>more
>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>>>
>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go
>with
>>>>
>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of
>PPC
>>>>
>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
>has
>>>>
>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>>>
>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>>> has
>>>>>>
>>>>>> no
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
DP(699)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> &
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield
>>>> pro
>>>>>>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture
>other
>>>>>>
>>>>>> than
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost
>6 years

>>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product
>that
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> served
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point
was
>>> revolutionary.
>>>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your
>>> only
>>>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying
that
>>>> naitive's
>>>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> more,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system
up
>to
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Pro
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come
>>> to
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>>>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the
>gap
>>>> between
>>>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had
the
>>> capability
>>>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
>>> found
>>>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the
mixer.

>>>>>
>>>>> This
>>>>>
>>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it,
>their
>>>>>
>>>>> SX-1
>>>>>
>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>> product
>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very
>>> cool
>>>>>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers
based
>>>>>
>>>>> DAW,
>>>>>
>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
>>>> faster
>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>> already..I
>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>>>
>>>>>> up
>>>>>
>>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
>Orginal
>>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if
>they
>>>>>
>>>>>> sink
>>>>>
>>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
ssound..
>>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
>Is
>>> it
>>>>>
>>>>>> that

>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry, that they can dictate
>>> jsut
>>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I
mean
>>>> is
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up
>for
>>>> HD..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
>>> software
>>>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm
>not
>>>> even
>>>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I
>were
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> them,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...)
Sorry.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than
>your
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along
>say
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> 3-15k
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> would do it..
>>>>>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>

>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 08:13:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.

Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked up to be:

I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and ad for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious guess.

The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick and low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr for it - no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way. Their rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the Walmart approach to production.

There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly, but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and heard from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.

The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro gear, and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't mean the product is any better for it.

I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy and not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic nirvana is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work for me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating a great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending \$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.

I'm off. Later.

Dedric

On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.net> wrote:

>
> La Mont,
>
> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around
> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on a native
> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets big
> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX
> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and then
> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here. I'm
> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O in
> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and EQ's.
> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For a while
> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I don't
> even think twice.
>
> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>
> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>
> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and a little
> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks, vocal
> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've
> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors
> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
> mix.....and
> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity and
> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro feel
> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to do
> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if I
> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*, though
> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>
> Deej
>
>
> "LaMont" <jjdpo@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>> hey Dedric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the
>> difference
>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>> version
>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they
> did

>> soemthing.
>>
>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>> floating
>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down
> the
>> audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain point.
>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>> counts.
>> LaMont
>>
>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching mixer
>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>
>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>
>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m.c.htm
>>>
>>> Or maybe,
>>>
>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>
>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>
>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>
>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>
>>>
>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with
> a
>> 64
>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the tool
>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear, but
>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>
>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit (assuming
>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
> but
>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Detric
>>>
>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1 @linux, "Deej"
>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:

>>>
>>>>
>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
> using
>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>
>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a moose
>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>> for
>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
> I
>> might
>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>
>>>> ;o)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>> what
>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>
>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
>>>> of
>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so ago.
>> They
>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
> is
>> that
>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces the
>>>>> non-computer
>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>> that
>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed
>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out
>> having
>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've been
>>>> on
>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>> system
>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
> game.

>>>> I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems
>> were
>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster CPU and
> OS..
>>>> In one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450) OS9
>> that's
>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setups still has Win 98se..Stable
>> stable
>>>> stable:)
>>>>
>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s
>> to
>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>> due
>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
>>>> conversations
>>>> about it's either PTHD or a solution with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>> Radar
>>>> with the yummy digital mixer.. Each setup cost. But, we demand a solid
>>>> working
>>>> system, that you do not have to make excuses to yourself and the client..
>>>>
>>>> Dedic may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated DSP
>> system
>>>> maybe a daunting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>> (Phonic
>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>> LaMont
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Although native CPUs are fast, don't think that you are getting off
>>>>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end
>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and

> an
>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than \$1000.
>>>>>
>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of
>> this
>>>>>
>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>
>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>>>>
>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>
>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of
>> the
>>>>>
>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>>>>
>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>
>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>> the
>>>>>
>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
> it
>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money just
>>>>>
>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>
>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,
>>>>>
>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>
>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
>> for
>>>>>
>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using

>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>>>>
>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>>>>>
>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>
>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>>>>
>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>> system.
>>>>>
>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>> and
>>>>>
>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>>>
>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>
>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>>>>
>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
> and
>>>>>
>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
> third
>>>>>
>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>>>>
>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>> 10K.
>>>>>
>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage may
>> vary.
>>>>>
>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
>> to
>>>>>
>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>
>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
>>>>>
>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>> cost.
>>>>>
>>>>>

>>>>>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the native
>>>>> cpu
>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>> DSP
>>>>>>
>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>> the
>>>>>>
>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
>>>>>>
>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>>>>
>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>> environment..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
> Logic
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
> If
>> I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
> get
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to
>> the
>>>>>>>

>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>> users
>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
>>>>> does
>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they
>>>> could've
>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
> to
>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>>>
>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
> with
>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and
>> truth
>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to be
>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not really
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie

>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Take care,
>>>>> Lamont
>>>>> take care
>>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs
>> are
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>>>>>
>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
> money
>>>>>
>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five
>> year
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
> say.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
>> more
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go
>> with
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty of

>> PPC
>>>>>
>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
>> has
>>>>>
>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>>>>
>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>>>> has
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
> DP(699)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> &
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield
>>>>> pro
>>>>>>>>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture
>> other
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> than
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost
>> 6 years
>>>>>>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>>>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product
>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> served
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point

>>>>>>
>>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>>> product
>>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very
>>>> cool
>>>>>>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers
> based
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> DAW,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer
>>>>> faster
>>>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>>> already..I
>>>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on
>>>>>>>> www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k
>>>>>>>> converters..
>>>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> up
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
>> Orginal
>>>>>>>>> list)???) Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if
>> they
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> sink
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
> ssound..
>>>>>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
>> Is
>>>> it
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
>>>> jsut
>>>>>>>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I
> mean

much alive and kicking and the feature set is simply incredible.

Regards
Babu

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>
>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
no
> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>
>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
&
>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield pro
>results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other
than
>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>
>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
served
>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.
> AND That's the point..
>
>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that naitive's
>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
more,
>it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to Pro
>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to an
>PT HD system.
>There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
>PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>
>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>-The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
>to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
>in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.
This
>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their SX-1
>was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product

>first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a very cool
>DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>
>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW,
>we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
>Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I
>say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..:)
>
>
>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up
>a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Orignal
>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they sink
>another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it that
>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is
,
>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>
>
>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
>support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were them,
>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
>
>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of
>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your current
>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say 3-15k
>would do it..
>Okay end of rant..LaMont
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 16:49:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I actually have very good converters sitting in a nice studio - I don't settle for decent. The kind of work we do is varied and extensive, from artist projects to mixing, to ad spots and full film composing, (my end of the business) in addition to video production/editing, print graphics and web design. My example wasn't contrasting a pro studio vs. mine - mine *is* a pro studio. The other facility has a corner of the market and long standing "pro" reputation from being here for 30 years. We are new, that's all.

I have over 20 years doing this, so my point in the debate was only that a \$1,000,000 facility or the most popular DAW on the market doesn't guarantee good work. I know where my gear has limits - I can easily hear flaws in every piece of gear I have, but without a \$1,000,000 budget to buy the absolute best of everything, I can't change that, and even then it would still be below my reference standards. For all but the most discerning clients, Nuendo and other DAWs are still head and shoulders above the average pro market just 5 years ago.

These discussions are all fine, but in the end only the product we deliver makes any difference. We deliver a very high quality product.

Yes, the Emu does have good converters for the money - better than Paris' were. I've installed a couple for churches' miscellaneous AV computers. I've also suggested to Emu they should make a 8-channel ADDA for the sub \$800 market. It's a missing price point for decent converters for project studios.

Dedric

On 1/16/06 10:07 AM, in article 43cbc4b7\$1@linux, "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> hey Dedric,
> To the contrary,
> I think for the kind of work your, Nuendo with decent converters "is" the
> perfect tool..Fast, editing,great clear wide, smooth sound.
>
> But, I will say that running Nuendo/Sx with Apogee (Rosetta, AD/DA 16x) does
> bring up the bottom end. Cheaper solution, I mix on friends SX setup using
> the EMU 1820M i/o unit. Great!! sound unit for only about \$500.00.Nice
> converters
> for the money..
>
> It all comes down to learning your gear, and getting the max usage out of
> it. Bottom line..Take care
>
>
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.
>>
>> Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked
>> up to be:
>>

>> I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
> ad
>> for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>> guess.
>>
>> The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>> use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>> compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>> compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
> and
>> low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr for
> it
>> - no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way. Their
>> rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>> Walmart approach to production.
>>
>> There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>> degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,
>> but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and heard
>> from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>>
>> The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro gear,
>> and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
> mean
>> the product is any better for it.
>>
>> I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>> product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
> and
>> not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic nirvana
>> is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work for
>> me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
> a
>> great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>> \$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>> when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>> compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>> nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>>
>> I'm off. Later.
>>
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1 @linux, "Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> La Mont,

>>>
>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around
>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
> a native
>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
> big
>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX
>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
> then
>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here. I'm
>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
> in
>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and EQ's.
>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
> a while
>>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I
> don't
>>> even think twice.
>>>
>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>
>>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>>>
>>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
> a little
>>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks, vocal
>>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've
>>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors
>>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>>> mix.....and
>>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
> and
>>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
> feel
>>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
> do
>>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if
> I
>>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
> though
>>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>>
>>> Deej
>>>
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpo@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> hey Dedric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the

>>>> difference
>>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>>>> version
>>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they
>>> did
>>>> soemthing.
>>>>
>>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>>> floating
>>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down
>>> the
>>>> audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
> point.
>>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>>>> counts.
>>>> LaMont
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
> mixer
>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>>
>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m.c.htm
>>>>>
>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>>
>>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with
>>> a
>>>> 64
>>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
> tool
>>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
> but
>>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>>
>>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit

>>>> (assuming
>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>>> but
>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Detric
>>>>
>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
>>> using
>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a
> moose
>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>>>> for
>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>>> I
>>>> might
>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>
>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>>> what
>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
>>>>>> of
>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so ago.
>>>> They
>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>>> is
>>>> that
>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
> the

>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>>> that
>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
> agreed
>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
> out
>>>> having
>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "treadmill" if you will. I've
> been
>>>>>> on
>>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>>>> system
>>>>>> setups I've destroyed due because I was trying to play the CPU sped
>>> game.
>>>>>> I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems
>>>> were
>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
>>> OS..
>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
> OS9
>>>> that's
>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>>>> stable
>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s
>>>> to
>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>>> due
>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a solution with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>>> Radar
>>>>>> with the yammy digital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a
> solid
>>>>>> working
>>>>>> system, that you do not have to make excuses to yourself and the
>>>>>> client..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedic may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
> dsp
>>>> system
>>>>>> maybe a daunting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>>> (Phonic
>>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are
>>>>>> astounding
>>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?

>>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off
>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end
>>>> a
>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and
>>>> an
>>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
> \$1000.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
> of
>>>> this
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
> of
>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
>>>> it
>>>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
> just
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
> the
>>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
> Close,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
>>>> for
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the
>>>>>>> transition
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>>> system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac

>>>>>
>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
>>> and
>>>>>
>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>>> third
>>>>>>
>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>>> 10K.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
> may
>>>> vary.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
>>>> to
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
> with
>>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
> video
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>>> cost.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the
> native
>>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>>>> DSP
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
> buying
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>> enviornment..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>>> Logic
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>> If
>>>> I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
>>> get
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
> to
>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>>> users
>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
> person
>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
> they
>>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>>> to
>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
> goes
>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>>> with
>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
> and
>>>> truth
>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to
> be
>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a
> MOTU
>>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
> moving
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
> really
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>>>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>>>>>> Lamont

>>>>>>> take care
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
 > CPUs
 >>>> are
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> faster?
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
 >>> money
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
 >>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five
 >>>> year
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
 >>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
 >>> say.
 >>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
 >>>> more
 >>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
 >>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to
 > go
 >>>> with
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
 >>>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty
 > of
 >>>> PPC
 >>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
 >>>> has

>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll
>>>>>>>> continue
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>>>>>>> has
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
>>> DP(699)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> &
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will
> yield
>>>>>>> pro
>>>>>>>>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture
>>>> other
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> than
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost
>>>> 6 years
>>>>>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product
>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> served
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point
>>>> was
>>>>>>>>>>>>> revolutionary.

>>>>>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system,
> your
>>>>>> only
>>>>>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying
>>> that
>>>>>>> naitive's
>>>>>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP
>>>>>>>>> DAW..Even
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> more,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system
>>> up
>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Pro
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually
> come
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>>>>>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the
>>>> gap
>>>>>>> between
>>>>>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had
>>> the
>>>>>>> capability
>>>>>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
>>>>>>>>> found
>>>>>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the
>>>>>>>>> capabilities
>>>>>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the
>>> mixer.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> This
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it,
>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> SX-1

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>>>>>> product
>>>>>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>>>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a
> very
>>>>> cool
>>>>>>>>>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers
>>> based
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> DAW,
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for
> newer
>>>>>>> faster
>>>>>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>>>>> already..I
>>>>>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on
>>>>>>>>>> www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k
>>>>>>>>>> converters..
>>>>>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into
>>>>>>>>>> "dressing
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> up
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
>>>> Orginal
>>>>>>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that
> if
>>>> they
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> sink
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
>>> ssound..
>>>>>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
>>>> Is
>>>>>>>>>> it
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
>>>>> jsut
>>>>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What
> I
>>> mean
>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> ,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save
> up
>>>> for
>>>>>> HD..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm
>>>> not
>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If
> I
>>>> were
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> them,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...)
>>> Sorry.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast
> market
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than
>>>> your
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along
>>>> say
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> 3-15k
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> would do it..
>>>>>>>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 16:57:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

good mornign DJ!!:)

Man, i love that song.(Put your faith in Love) It touched my heart. Love those acoustic guitars and mandolin & violin.. Great job.

You are right, mixing in Nuendo/SX is a learned" skill-set :) Especially if you trying to mix ITB with any external summing help.

Personally for me, I'll use Nuendo to create(vsti),audio tracking,editing..Then off to Paris or ProTool for mixing.. Every now and then, I'll go a mix, but after things starts getting "scewy", I 'll start the exporting..

Take care,
LaMont

"Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.not> wrote:

>
>La Mont,
>
>I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around >24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on a native >system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets big >again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX >automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and then >tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here. I'm >using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O in >my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and EQ's. >In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For a while >I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I don't >even think twice.
>
>Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.

>
> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Love/)
>
>It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and a little
>de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks, vocal
>track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've
>got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors
>in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the mix.....and
>what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
and
>accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro feel
>and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to do
>with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if I
>sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*, though
>NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>
>Deej
>
>
>"LaMont" <jjdp@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>hey Detric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the
difference
>>form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
version
>>5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they
>did
>>soemthing.
>>
>>Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
floating
>>point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down
>the
>>audio bandwidth, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain point.
>>32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summing with high track
counts.
>>LaMont
>>
>>Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
mixer
>>>from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>>>are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>
>>>One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>
>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m c.htm

>>>
>>>Or maybe,
>>>
>>><http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>
>>>That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>
>>>This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>
>>><http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>
>>>
>>>BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with
>a
>>64
>>>bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
tool
>>>palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear, but
>>>that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>
>>>I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit (assuming
>>>Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>but
>>>I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>
>>>Regards,
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>>On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>><hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
>using
>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>
>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a
moose
>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>>for
>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>l
>>might
>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>
>>>> ;o)

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>what
>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>
>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
>>>> of
>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so ago.
>>They
>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>is
>>that
>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
the
>>>>> non-computer
>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>that
>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all agreed
>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with out
>>having
>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've
been
>>>> on
>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>>system
>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
>game.
>>>>> I've lost decket paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems
>>were
>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
>OS..
>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
OS9
>>that's
>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>>stable
>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>
>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s
>>to
>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>due

>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
>>>> conversations
>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>Radar
>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a solid
>>>> working
>>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the client..
>>>>
>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
dsp
>>system
>>>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>(Phonic
>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>> LaMont
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off
>>cheap.
>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>> very
>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end
>>a
>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and
>>an
>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
\$1000.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of
>>this
>>>>>>
>>>>>> discussion).>>>>>>
>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast

>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>>>>
>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>
>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some of
>>the
>>>>>
>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>>>>
>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>
>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>the
>>>>>
>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
>it
>>>>> was a noticeable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
just
>>>>>
>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>
>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me, the
>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed. Close,
>>>>>
>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>
>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
>>for
>>>>>
>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>>>>
>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>>>>>
>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>
>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>>>>
>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>system.
>>>>>

>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>>and
>>>>>
>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>>>
>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>
>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>>>>
>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
>and
>>>>>
>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>third
>>>>>
>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>>>>
>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>10K.
>>>>>
>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
may
>>vary.
>>>>>
>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
>>to
>>>>>
>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade with
>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>
>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or video
>>>>>
>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>cost.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the
native
>>>>> cpu
>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>
>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>>DSP
>>>>>
>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>>the

>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just buying
>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>> environment..
>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>Logic
>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>If
>>I
>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
>get
>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
>>of
>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used to
>>the
>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>users
>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>> converters..All

>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native person
>>>>> does
>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than they
>>>> could've
>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>to
>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers goes
>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>>>>
>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>with
>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs, and
>>truth
>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to
be
>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a MOTU
>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24 moving
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
really
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Take care,

>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native CPUs
>>are
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>>>>>
>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
>>money
>>>>>
>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five
>>year
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>>>>>
>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>>>>>
>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
>>say.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
>>more
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>>>>
>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to go
>>with
>>>>>
>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty
>>of
>>PPC
>>>>>
>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
>>has
>>>>>

>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>>>>
>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>>>> has
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
>DP(699)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> &
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will
yield
>>>>>> pro
>>>>>>>>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture
>>other
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> than
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost
>>6 years
>>>>>>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>>>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product
>>that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> served
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point
>was
>>>> revolutionary.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system,
your
>>>> only
>>>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying
>that
>>>>> naitive's
>>>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> more,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system
>up
>>to
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Pro
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually
come
>>>> to
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>>>>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the
>>gap
>>>>> between
>>>>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had
>the
>>>> capability
>>>>>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
>>>> found
>>>>>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>>>>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the
>mixer.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it,
>>their
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> SX-1
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>>>>>> product
>>>>>>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..

>>>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a
very
>>>> cool
>>>>>>> DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers
>based
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> DAW,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for
newer
>>>>> faster
>>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>>> already..I
>>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> up
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
>>Orginal
>>>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that
if
>>they
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> sink
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
>ssound..
>>>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
>>ls
>>>> it
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
>>>> jsut
>>>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I
>mean
>>>>> is
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> ,

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up
>>for
>>>> HD..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
>>>> software
>>>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm
>>not
>>>>> even
>>>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If
I
>>were
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> them,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...)
>Sorry.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast
market
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than
>>your
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along
>>say
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 3-15k
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> would do it..
>>>>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 17:07:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hey Dedic,
To the contrary,
I think for the kind of work your, Nuendo with decent converters "is" the perfect tool..Fast, editing,great clear wide, smooth sound.

But, I will say that running Nuendo/Sx with Apogee (Rosetta, AD/DA 16x) does bring up the bottom end. Cheaper solution, I mix on friends SX setup using the EMU 1820M i/o unit. Great!! sound unit for only about \$500.00.Nice converters for the money..

It all comes down to learning your gear, and getting the max usage out of it. Bottom line..Take care

Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.

>

>Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked

>up to be:

>

>I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and ad

>for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious

>guess.

>

>The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later

>use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over

>compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before

>compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick

and

>low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr for it

>- no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way. Their

>rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the

>Walmart approach to production.

>

>There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly

>degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,

>but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and heard

>from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.

>

>The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro gear,

>and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't

mean

>the product is any better for it.
>
>I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
>and
>not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic nirvana
>is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work for
>me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
>a
>great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>\$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>
>I'm off. Later.
>
>Dedric
>
>On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>wrote:
>
>>
>> La Mont,
>>
>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around
>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
>> a native
>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
>> big
>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX
>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
>> then
>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here. I'm
>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
>> in
>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and EQ's.
>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
>> a while
>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I
>> don't
>> even think twice.
>>
>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>
>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>>
>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and

a little

>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks, vocal
>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've
>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors
>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>> mix.....and

>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
and

>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
feel

>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
do

>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if

I

>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
though

>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.

>>

>> Deej

>>

>>

>> "LaMont" <jjdpo@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>>

>>> hey Detric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the
>>> difference

>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.

>>> version

>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they

>> did

>>> soemthing.

>>>

>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>> floating

>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down
>> the

>>> audio bandwidth, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
point.

>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>>> counts.

>>> LaMont

>>>

>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
mixer

>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity

>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.

>>>>

>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:

>>>>
>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-mc.htm
>>>>
>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>
>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>
>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with
>> a
>>> 64
>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
tool
>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
but
>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>
>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit (assuming
>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>> but
>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Detric
>>>>
>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
>> using
>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a
moose
>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>>> for
>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>> I
>>> might

>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>
>>>> ;o)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>> what
>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>
>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
>>>>> of
>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so ago.
>>> They
>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>> is
>>> that
>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
the
>>>>> non-computer
>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>> that
>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
agreed
>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
out
>>> having
>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've
been
>>>>> on
>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>>> system
>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuae I was trying to play the CPU sped
>> game.
>>>>> I've lost dectet paying mixng and production jobs becuae my systems
>>> were
>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
>> OS..
>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
OS9
>>> that's
>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>>> stable
>>>>> stable:)

>>>>>
>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s
>>> to
>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>> due
>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
>>>>> conversations
>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>> Radar
>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a
solid
>>>> working
>>>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the client..
>>>>>
>>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
dsp
>>> system
>>>>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>> (Phonic
>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off
>>> cheap.
>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>> very
>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end
>>> a
>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and
>> an
>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
\$1000.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
of

>>> this
>>>>>
>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>
>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>>>>>
>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
of
>>> the
>>>>>>
>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>> the
>>>>>>
>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
>> it
>>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
just
>>>>>>
>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
the
>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
Close,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
>>> for
>>>>>>
>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.

>>>>>
>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>>>>>
>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>>>>>
>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>> system.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>>> and
>>>>>>
>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>>>>
>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>>>>>
>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
>> and
>>>>>>
>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>> third
>>>>>>
>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>> 10K.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
may
>>> vary.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
>>> to
>>>>>>
>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
with
>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
video
>>>>>>
>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>> cost.

>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the native
>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>>> DSP
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
buying
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>> environment..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>> Logic
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>> I
>>> I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
>> get
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
>>> of

>>>>>
>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
to
>>> the
>>>>>
>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>> users
>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
person
>>>>>> does
>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
they
>>>>> could've
>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>> to
>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
goes
>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, Ican
>> with
>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
and
>>> truth
>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to
be
>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a
MOTU
>>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
moving
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.

>> say.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
>>> more
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to
go
>>> with
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty
of
>>> PPC
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
>>> has
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>>>>> has
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
>> DP(699)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> &
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will
yield

>>>>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had
>> the
>>>>> capability
>>>>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
>>>>> found
>>>>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the
>>>>>>>> capabilities
>>>>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the
>> mixer.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> This
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it,
>>> their
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> SX-1
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>>>>> product
>>>>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a
very
>>>>> cool
>>>>>>>>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers
>> based
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> DAW,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for
newer
>>>>>>>>> faster
>>>>>>>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>>>>>>>>>> already..I
>>>>>>>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>>>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> converters..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

market
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than
>>> your
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along
>>> say
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 3-15k
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> would do it..
>>>>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 17:10:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Babu,
I really did not knwo how Soundscape was doing these day. Since most US distributors stoped running adds for the system. I'm glad they have made a or kept a steady surgence in the market. At our studio we have the Alesis HD24xr(s) dedicated 24 track units, and they are rock solid and sound great.

"Music Lab Sweden" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:
>

very
>much alive and kicking and the feature set is simply incredible.
>
>Regards
>Babu
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>
>>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>
>>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
>no
>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>
>>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
>&
>>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will yield pro
>>results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture other
>than
>>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>>
>>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
>served
>>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.
>> AND That's the point..
>>
>>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>>other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying that naitive's
>>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even
>more,
>>it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system up to Pro
>>standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to
>an
>>PT HD system.
>>There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in the gap between
>>PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>
>>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>-The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability
>>to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found
>>in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities
>>to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.

>This
>>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their
SX-1
>>was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU product
>>first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield a very cool
>>DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>
>>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW,
>>we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster
>>Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I

>>say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..:)
>>
>>
>>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearsnitz.com
>>about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters..
>>I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up
>>a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original
>>list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they
sink
>>another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic ssound..
>>So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it
that
>>Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut
>>how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is
>,
>>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..
>>
>>
>>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software
>>support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm not even
>>a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If I were them,
>>I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.
>>
>>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of
>>Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your
current
>>offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say
3-15k
>>would do it..
>>Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 19:33:58 GMT

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

"I've also suggested to Emu they should make a 8-channel ADDA for the sub
\$800 market. It's a missing price point for decent converters for project
studios."

Now, that's what I'm talking about, trying to make the manufactures to make
mid-level segment product and not jsut settle for the Lower end of the spectrum..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>I actually have very good converters sitting in a nice studio - I don't

>settle for decent. The kind of work we do is varied and extensive, from
>artist projects to mixing, to ad spots and full film composing, (my end
of
>the business) in addition to video production/editing, print graphics and
>web design. My example wasn't contrasting a pro studio vs. mine - mine
is
>a pro studio. The other facility has a corner of the market and long
>standing "pro" reputation from being here for 30 years. We are new, that's
>all.
>
>I have over 20 years doing this, so my point in the debate was only that
a
>\$1,000,000 facility or the most popular DAW on the market doesn't guarantee
>good work. I know where my gear has limits - I can easily hear flaws in
>every piece of gear I have, but without a \$1,000,000 budget to buy the
>absolute best of everything, I can't change that, and even then it would
>still be below my reference standards. For all but the most discerning
>clients, Nuendo and other DAWs are still head and shoulders above the
>average pro market just 5 years ago.
>
>These discussions are all fine, but in the end only the product we deliver
>makes any difference. We deliver a very high quality product.
>
>Yes, the Emu does have good converters for the money - better than Paris'
>were. I've installed a couple for churches' miscellaneous AV computers.
>I've also suggested to Emu they should make a 8-channel ADDA for the sub
>\$800 market. It's a missing price point for decent converters for project
>studios.
>
>Dedric
>
>
>On 1/16/06 10:07 AM, in article 43cbc4b7\$1@linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> hey Dedric,
>> To the contrary,
>> I think for the kind of work your, Nuendo with decent converters "is"
the
>> perfect tool..Fast, editing,great clear wide, smooth sound.
>>
>> But, I will say that running Nuendo/Sx with Apogee (Rosetta, AD/DA 16x)
does
>> bring up the bottom end. Cheaper solution, I mix on friends SX setup using
>> the EMU 1820M i/o unit. Great!! sound unit for only about \$500.00.Nice
>> converters
>> for the money..

>>
>> It all comes down to learning your gear, and getting the max usage out of
of
>> it. Bottom line..Take care
>>
>>
>>
>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.
>>>
>>> Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked
>>> up to be:
>>>
>>> I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
>> ad
>>> for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>>> guess.
>>>
>>> The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>>> use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>>> compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>>> compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
>> and
>>> low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr
for
>> it
>>> - no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way.
Their
>>> rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>>> Walmart approach to production.
>>>
>>> There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>>> degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,
>>> but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and
heard
>>> from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>>>
>>> The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro
gear,
>>> and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
>> mean
>>> the product is any better for it.
>>>
>>> I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>>> product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
>> and
>>> not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic nirvana
>>> is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work

for
>>> me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
>> a
>>> great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>>> \$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>>> when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>>> compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>>> nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>>>
>>> I'm off. Later.
>>>
>>> Dedic
>>>
>>> On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.net>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> La Mont,
>>>>
>>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around
>>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
>> a native
>>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
>> big
>>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX
>>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
>> then
>>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here.
I'm
>>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
>> in
>>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and
EQ's.
>>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
>> a while
>>>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now
I
>> don't
>>>> even think twice.
>>>>
>>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>>
>>>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>>>>
>>>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
>> a little
>>>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks,
vocal

>>>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've
>>>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors
>>>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>>>> mix.....and
>>>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
>> and
>>>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
>> feel
>>>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
>> do
>>>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same
>> if
>> I
>>>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
>> though
>>>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>>>
>>>> Deej
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdp@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> hey Dedric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear
>>>>> the
>>>>> difference
>>>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>>>>> version
>>>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So,
>>>>> they
>>>>> did
>>>>> soemthing.
>>>>>
>>>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>>>> floating
>>>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and
>>>>> down
>>>>> the
>>>>> audio bandwidth, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
>>>>> point.
>>>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>>>>> counts.
>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
>>>>>> mixer
>>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.

>>>>>
>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-mc.htm
>>>>>
>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>>
>>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right
with
>>>> a
>>>>> 64
>>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in
the
>> tool
>>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
>> but
>>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>>
>>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit
>>>>> (assuming
>>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>>>> but
>>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedic
>>>>>
>>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzzz> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I
was
>>>> using
>>>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with

a
>> moose
>>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>>>> for
>>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>>>> I
>>>> might
>>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
need
>>>>> what
>>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer
buddies
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so
ago.
>>>>> They
>>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us
all
>>>> is
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
>> the
>>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
>> agreed
>>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
>> out
>>>>> having
>>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've
>> been
>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>>>>> system
>>>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped

>>>> game.
>>>>>>> I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems
>>>>>>> were
>>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu
and
>>>> OS..
>>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
>> OS9
>>>>>>> that's
>>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>>>>>>> stable
>>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual
867s
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>>>>>> due
>>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred
our
>>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>>>>>> Radar
>>>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand
a
>> solid
>>>>>>> working
>>>>>>> system, that you do not have to make excuses to yourself and the
>>>>>>> client..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
>> dsp
>>>>>>> system
>>>>>>> maybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>>>>>> (Phonic
>>>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are
>>>>>>> astounding
>>>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting
off
>>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much
less
>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low
end
>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that
and
>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
>> \$1000.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
need
>>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
>> of
>>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle,
they're
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
>> of
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based
systems.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>>>>> the

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS
and
>>>> it
>>>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
>> just
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
>> the
>>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
>> Close,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate
DSP
>>>>> for
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native
system
>>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but
using
>>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating
system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS
pretty
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the
>>>>>>> transition
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>>>> system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade

>>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra
RAM
>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>>>> third
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten
years.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>>>> 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
>> may
>>>>> vary.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the
need
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
>> with
>>>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
>> video
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>>>> cost.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the
>> native
>>>>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>>>>> DSP
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just

>> buying
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>> enviornment..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>>>> Logic
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>>> If
>>>>> I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I
can
>>>> get
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle
part
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
>> to
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>>>> users
>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average

>>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
>> person
>>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
>> they
>>>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>>>> to
>>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
>> goes
>>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>>>> with
>>>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
>> and
>>>>> truth
>>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot
>> to
>> be
>>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer,
>> a
>> MOTU
>>>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
>> moving
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
>> really
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around
>>>>>>>>>>> long
>>>>>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS.

Even

>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>>>> -Jamie

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

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Take care,

>>>>>>> Lamont

>>>>>>> take care

>>>>>>>

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

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native

>> CPUs

>>>> are

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> faster?

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more

>>>> money

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).

>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a

five

>>>>> year

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they

>>>>> say.

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into

>>>>>>> between
>>>>>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also
had
>>>> the
>>>>>>> capability
>>>>>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool
editing
>>>>>>> found
>>>>>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the
>>>>>>>>> capabilities
>>>>>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for
the
>>>> mixer.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> This
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried
it,
>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> SX-1
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actualy, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>>>>>> product
>>>>>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>>>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marrige would yield
a
>> very
>>>>>>> cool
>>>>>>>>>>> DM2000 metts Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers
>>>> based
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> DAW,
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for
>> newer
>>>>>>> faster
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>>>>> already..I
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

I see it was really important to put your house clock in an oven to get better stability, so much so that you found it necessary to insult your peers on a recording forum. So why does the bass guitar you recorded sound like it's coming from a dog's ass?" Most of the discussions I have been reading lately on audio groups seem to be fundamentally pennywise and pound foolish. It reminds me of audiophiles that put sandbags on top of their \$10,000 CD player to damp mechanical resonances and then play the unit in a rectangular room with no wall treatments. I think the recording industry suffers collectively from a problem with priorities.

BTW, I heard the tracks from Albini's studio (recorded by another house engineer).

-Chris

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.

>

>Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked

>up to be:

>

>I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and ad

>for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious >guess.

>

>The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later

>use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over

>compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before

>compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick and

>low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr for it

>- no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way. Their

>rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the

>Walmart approach to production.

>

>There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly

>degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,

>but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and heard

>from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.

>

>The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro gear,

>and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't

mean

>the product is any better for it.

>

>I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
and
>not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic nirvana
>is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work for
>me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
a
>great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>\$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>
>I'm off. Later.
>
>Dedric
>
>On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>wrote:
>
>>
>> La Mont,
>>
>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around
>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
a native
>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
big
>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX
>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
then
>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here. I'm
>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
in
>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and EQ's.
>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
a while
>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I
don't
>> even think twice.
>>
>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>
>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Love/)
>>
>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
a little
>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks, vocal

>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've
>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors
>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>> mix.....and
>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
and
>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
feel
>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
do
>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if
I
>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
though
>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>
>> Deej
>>
>>
>> "LaMont" <jjdp@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>> hey Dedic, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the
>>> difference
>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>>> version
>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they
>> did
>>> soemthing.
>>>
>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>> floating
>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down
>> the
>>> audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
point.
>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>>> counts.
>>> LaMont
>>>
>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
mixer
>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>
>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>
>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m c.htm

>>>>
>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>
>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>
>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with
>> a
>>> 64
>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
tool
>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
but
>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>
>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit (assuming
>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>> but
>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Detric
>>>>
>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1 @linux, "Deej"
>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
>> using
>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a
moose
>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>>> for
>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>> I
>>> might
>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>

>>>> ;o)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>> what
>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>
>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
>>>>> of
>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so ago.
>>> They
>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>> is
>>> that
>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
the
>>>>> non-computer
>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>> that
>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
agreed
>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
out
>>> having
>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've
been
>>>>> on
>>>>> that treadmill since 97, and as I look back on how many great working
>>> system
>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
>> game.
>>>>> I've lost dectet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems
>>> were
>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
>> OS..
>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
OS9
>>> that's
>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>>> stable
>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>
>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual 867s

>>> to
>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>> due
>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
>>>>> conversations
>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>> Radar
>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a
solid
>>>>> working
>>>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the client..
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedicric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
dsp
>>> system
>>>>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>> (Phonic
>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off
>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end
>>> a
>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and
>> an
>>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
\$1000.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
of
>>> this
>>>>>>>

>>>>>> discussion).

>>>>>>

>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>>>>>

>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>> computer-based systems.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
of
>>> the
>>>>>>

>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>> the
>>>>>>

>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
>> it
>>>>>> was a noticeable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
just
>>>>>>

>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
the
>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
Close,
>>>>>>

>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
>>> for
>>>>>>

>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty

>>>>>
>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>>>>>
>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>> system.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>>> and
>>>>>>
>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>>>>
>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>>>>>
>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
>> and
>>>>>>
>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>> third
>>>>>>
>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>> 10K.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
may
>>> vary.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
>>> to
>>>>>>
>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
with
>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
video
>>>>>>
>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>> cost.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>

>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the native
>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>>> DSP
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
buying
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>> environment..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>> Logic
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>> If
>>> I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
>> get
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used

to
>>> the
>>>>>
>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>> users
>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
person
>>>>>> does
>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
they
>>>>> could've
>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>> to
>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
goes
>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, Ican
>> with
>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
and
>>> truth
>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to
be
>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a
MOTU
>>>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
moving
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not

really

>>>>>

>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm

>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long

>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even

>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>>> -Jamie

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

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Take care,

>>>>>>> Lamont

>>>>>>> take care

>>>>>>>

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

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
CPUs

>>> are

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> faster?

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more

>> money

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).

>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five

>>> year

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they

>> say.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
>>> more
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to
go
>>> with
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty
of
>>> PPC
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
>>> has
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>>>>> has
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
>> DP(699)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> &
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will
yield
>>>>>>> pro
>>>>>>>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture

>>>>>>>>> a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
>>> Original
>>>>>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that
if
>>> they
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> sink
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
>> ssound..
>>>>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
>>> Is
>>>> it
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
>>>> jsut
>>>>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What
I
>> mean
>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> ,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save
up
>>> for
>>>>>> HD..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little
>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now?? I'm
>>> not
>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If
I
>>> were
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> them,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...)
>> Sorry.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast
market
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than
>>> your
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along
>>> say
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> 3-15k
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> would do it..
>>>>>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 21:36:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thad,

I think most PARIS users here agree that when mixing "correctly" with about any DAW that the sound will be very close. Whatever "magic" people hear in PARIS happens when the various gain stages are pushed and pulled. Now, some make the claim that the fact you can push PARIS into the red in various areas, but not get that digital clipping "gack" (and in fact can get some very cool changes in character) is a flaw. Well, to each his own. I also use DP 4.6, and the difference in the sound of my mixes is dramatic. I always like my PARIS mixes better, but after all I am a brainwashed PARIS zealot, spreading unsubstantiated rumor and innuendo! ;>)

Tony

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43cc0a29\$1@linux...
>
> Hey Dedic,
>

> Here's my take on this. I bought the DAW CD from Lynn What's His Name. I
> listened to it. I took the tests. I took them again. I had someone jumble
> the tracks around and play them for me again. There were tiny wisp of
> smoke
> differences between the "best" and the "worst." On top of that, in an ABY
> test I can't imagine anyone doing dramatically better than a coin flip.
> Maybe,
> just maybe, a handful could, but I doubt even that.
>
> So, for me, that put the "summing bus" issue to rest. Until someone can
> give
> me proof, and by proof I mean ABY testing or real matmatcal analysis or
> resulting audio files from different systems, I will believe that all
> properly
> written summing busses sound essentially the same. After that summing bus
> CD came out suddenly the critiques of summing busses moved into other
> areas
> like certain frequencies (that apparently weren't on the tesing CD) and
> higher
> track counts and acoustic instruments and so on. When someone gets me
> evidence
> I'll be interested again, but until then I'm happily over here using SX
> and
> Live. So is DJ Krush and about a million other talented people who I am
> happy
> to have as my company.
>
> TCB
>
> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.
>>
>>Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked
>>up to be:
>>
>>I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
> ad
>>for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>>guess.
>>
>>The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>>use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>>compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>>compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
> and
>>low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr for
> it
>>- no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way.

>>Their
>>rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>>Walmart approach to production.
>>
>>There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>>degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,
>>but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and
>>heard
>>from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>>
>>The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro
>>gear,
>>and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
> mean
>>the product is any better for it.
>>
>>I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>>product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
> and
>>not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic
>>nirvana
>>is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work for
>>me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
> a
>>great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>>\$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>>when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>>compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>>nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>>
>>I'm off. Later.
>>
>>Dedric
>>
>>On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej"
>><yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>>wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> La Mont,
>>>
>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at
>>> around
>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
> a native
>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
> big
>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and

>>> fader/FX
>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
> then
>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here. I'm
>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
> in
>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and
>>> EQ's.
>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
> a while
>>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I
> don't
>>> even think twice.
>>>
>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>
>>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>>>
>>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
> a little
>>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks,
>>> vocal
>>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks.
>>> They've
>>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog
>>> processors
>>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>>> mix.....and
>>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
> and
>>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
> feel
>>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
> do
>>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if
> I
>>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
> though
>>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>>
>>> Deej
>>>
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpo@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> hey Detric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the
>>>> difference
>>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.

>>>> version
>>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they
>>> did
>>>> soemthing.
>>>>
>>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>>> floating
>>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down
>>> the
>>>> audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
> point.
>>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>>>> counts.
>>>> LaMont
>>>>
>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
> mixer
>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased
>>>>> productivity
>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>>
>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m.c.htm
>>>>>
>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>>
>>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with
>>> a
>>>> 64
>>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
> tool
>>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
> but
>>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>>
>>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit
>>>>> (assuming

>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>>> but
>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedic
>>>>
>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1 @linux, "Deej"
>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
>>> using
>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a
> moose
>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or
>>>>> Lavry's
>>>> for
>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>>> I
>>>> might
>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>
>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
>>>>>> need
>>>> what
>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer
>>>>>> buddies
>>>>>> of
>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so
>>>>>> ago.
>>>> They
>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>>> is

>>>> that
>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
> the
>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>>> that
>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
> agreed
>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
> out
>>>> having
>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "treadmill" if you will. I've
> been
>>>>>> on
>>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>>>> system
>>>>>> setups I've destroyed due because I was trying to play the CPU sped
>>> game.
>>>>>> I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems
>>>> were
>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
>>> OS..
>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
> OS9
>>>> that's
>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>>>> stable
>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>
>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual
>>>>>> 867s
>>>> to
>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>>> due
>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>>> Radar
>>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a
> solid
>>>>>> working
>>>>>> system, that you do not have to make excuses to yourself and the
>>>>>> client..
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
> dsp
>>>> system
>>>>>> maybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China

>>>> (Phonic
>>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are
>>>>>> astounding
>>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting off
>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not
>>>>>>>> productive..2)
>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end
>>>> a
>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and
>>> an
>>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
> \$1000.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
>>>>>>>> need
>>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
> of
>>>> this
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle,
>>>>>>>> they're
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some

> of
>>>> the
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based
>>>>>>> systems.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
>>>> it
>>>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished,
>>>>>>> broken
>>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
> just
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
> the
>>>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
> Close,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
>>>> for
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native
>>>>>>>> system
>>>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but
>>>>>>>> using
>>>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating
>>>>>>>> system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS
>>>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the
>>>>>>>> transition
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>>> system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the
>>>>>>> software
>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and
>>>>>>> computer
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the
>>>>>>> upgrade
>>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad
>>>>>>> PowerMac
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>>> third
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten
>>>>>>> years.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>>> 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
> may
>>>> vary.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
>>>> to
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
> with
>>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
> video
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>>> cost.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the
> native
>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a
>>>>>>> hardware-limited
>>>> DSP
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five
>>>>>>> years,
>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
> buying
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading
>>>>>>> everything
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>> environment..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my
>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>>> Logic
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>> If
>>>> I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
>>> get
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers

>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle
>>>>>>> part
>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
> to
>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutiios is that
>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>>> users
>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
> person
>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
> they
>>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>>> to
>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
> goes
>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a
>>>>>>> ProTools
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>>> with
>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
> and
>>>> truth
>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to
> be
>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a
> MOTU

>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
> moving
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
> really
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS.
>>>>>>> Even
>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
> CPUs
>>>> are
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just
>>>>>>>>>> getting
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
>>> money
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> DSP).
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> five

>>>> year
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be
>>>>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC,
>>>>>>>> probably
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
>>> say.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand
>>>>>>>> into
>>>> more
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the
>>>>>>>> market.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to
> go
>>>> with
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty
> of
>>>> PPC
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac
>>>>>>>> which
>>>> has
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll
>>>>>>>> continue
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris
>>>>>>>>> DAW(\$2700list)there
>>>>>> has
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
>>> DP(699)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> &
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will
> yield
>>>>>>> pro
>>>>>>>>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one
>>>>>>>>> manufacture
>>>> other
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> than
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost
>>>> 6 years
>>>>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a
>>>>>>>>> product
>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> served
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point
>>> was
>>>>>> revolutionary.
>>>>>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system,
> your
>>>>>> only
>>>>>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying
>>> that
>>>>>>> naitive's
>>>>>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP
>>>>>>>>> DAW..Even
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> more,

>>>>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers
>>> based
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> DAW,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for
> newer
>>>>>>> faster
>>>>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed
>>>>>>>>> demon.Enough
>>>>>>> already..I
>>>>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i
>>>>>>>>> digress
>>>>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on
>>>>>>>>> www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k
>>>>>>>>> converters..
>>>>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into
>>>>>>>>> "dressing
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> up
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for
>>>>>>>>> (2,700.00
>>>> Orginal
>>>>>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that
> if
>>>> they
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> sink
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
>>> ssound..
>>>>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
>>>> Is
>>>>>>>>> it
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can
>>>>>>>>>> dictate
>>>>>>>> jsut
>>>>>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What
> I
>>> mean

>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> ,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save
> up
>>>> for
>>>>>> HD..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS,
>>>>>>>>> little
>>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>> support. do they really think that this was good move now?? I'm
>>>> not
>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users. If
> I
>>>> were
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> them,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...)
>>> Sorry.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast
> market
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features
>>>>>>>>>> than
>>>> your
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> offering, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing
>>>>>>>>>>> along
>>>> say
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> 3-15k
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> would do it..
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Okay end of rant..LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [TCB](#) on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 22:03:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Dedic,

Here's my take on this. I bought the DAW CD from Lynn What's His Name. I listened to it. I took the tests. I took them again. I had someone jumble the tracks around and play them for me again. There were tiny wisp of smoke differences between the "best" and the "worst." On top of that, in an ABY test I can't imagine anyone doing dramatically better than a coin flip. Maybe, just maybe, a handful could, but I doubt even that.

So, for me, that put the "summing bus" issue to rest. Until someone can give me proof, and by proof I mean ABY testing or real matmatical analysis or resulting audio files from different systems, I will believe that all properly written summing busses sound essentially the same. After that summing bus CD came out suddenly the critiques of summing busses moved into other areas like certain frequencies (that apparently weren't on the tesing CD) and higher track counts and acoustic instruments and so on. When someone gets me evidence I'll be interested again, but until then I'm happily over here using SX and Live. So is DJ Krush and about a million other talented people who I am happy to have as my company.

TCB

Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.

>

>Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked

>up to be:

>

>I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and ad

>for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious

>guess.

>

>The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later

>use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over

>compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before

>compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
and
>low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr for
it
>- no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way. Their
>rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>Walmart approach to production.
>
>There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,
>but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and heard
>from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>
>The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro gear,
>and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
mean
>the product is any better for it.
>
>I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
and
>not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic nirvana
>is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work for
>me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
a
>great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>\$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>
>I'm off. Later.
>
>Dedric
>
>On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>wrote:
>
>>
>> La Mont,
>>
>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around
>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
a native
>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
big
>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX
>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and

then

>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here. I'm
>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
in

>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and EQ's.
>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog and digital reverbs and delays. For
a while

>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I
don't

>> even think twice.

>>

>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.

>>

>> <http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Love/>

>>

>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
a little

>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks, vocal

>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've

>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors

>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the

>> mix.....and

>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
and

>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
feel

>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
do

>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if

I

>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
though

>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.

>>

>> Deej

>>

>>

>> "LaMont" <jjdpo@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>>

>>> hey Detric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the
>>> difference

>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.

>>> version

>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they

>> did

>>> soemthing.

>>>

>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit

>>> floating
>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down
>> the
>>> audio bandwidth, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
point.
>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summing with high track
>>> counts.
>>> LaMont
>>>
>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
mixer
>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>
>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>
>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-mc.htm
>>>>
>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>
>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>
>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with
>> a
>>> 64
>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
tool
>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
but
>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>
>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit (assuming
>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>> but
>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Detric
>>>>
>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"

>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzzz> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
>> using
>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with a
moose
>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>>> for
>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>> I
>>> might
>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>
>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>> what
>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
>>>>> of
>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so ago.
>>> They
>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>> is
>>> that
>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
the
>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>> that
>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
agreed
>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
out
>>> having
>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've

been
>>>> on
>>>>> that treadmill since 97, and as I look back on how many great working
>>> system
>>>>> setups I've destroyed due because I was trying to play the CPU speed
>> game.
>>>>> I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems
>>> were
>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster CPU and
>> OS..
>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
OS9
>>> that's
>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se.. Stable
>>> stable
>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>
>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream, from Dual 867s
>>> to
>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX.. Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>> due
>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred our
>>>>> conversations
>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>> Radar
>>>>> with the yammy digital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a
solid
>>>>> working
>>>>> system, that you do not have to make excuses to yourself and the client..
>>>>>
>>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
dsp
>>> system
>>>>> maybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>> (Phonic
>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Although native CPUs are fast, don't think that you are getting off

>>> cheap.
>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>>> very
>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low end
>>> a
>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and
>> an
>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
\$1000.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you need
>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
of
>>> this
>>>>>>
>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>
>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle, they're
>>>>>>
>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
of
>>> the
>>>>>>
>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>> the
>>>>>>
>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
>> it
>>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
just
>>>>>>

>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
the
>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
Close,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
>>> for
>>>>>>
>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>>>>>>
>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>>>>>
>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>> system.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>>> and
>>>>>>
>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>>>>
>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>>>>>
>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
>> and
>>>>>>
>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>> third
>>>>>>
>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>> 10K.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
may
>>> vary.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
>>> to
>>>>>
>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
with
>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
video
>>>>>
>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>> cost.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the
native
>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>>> DSP
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
buying
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>> enviornment..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>> Logic
>>>>>>>

>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>> If
>>> I
>>>>>>
>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
>> get
>>>>>>
>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle part
>>> of
>>>>>>
>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
to
>>> the
>>>>>>
>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>> users
>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
person
>>>>>> does
>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
they
>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>> to
>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
goes
>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>> with
>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
and
>>> truth
>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to
be
>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a
MOTU
>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
moving
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
really
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS. Even
>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
CPUs
>>> are
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just getting
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> faster?

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
>> money
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or DSP).
>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a five
>>> year
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC, probably
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
>> say.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand into
>>> more
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the market.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to
go
>>> with
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty
of
>>> PPC
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac which
>>> has
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll continue
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> it's a known fact that, if you were to build your native system
>> up
>>> to
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Pro
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually
come
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>>>>>> There has to be a manufacturer that will stand up and fill in the
>>> gap
>>>>>> between
>>>>>>>>> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>>>>> -The Mackie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had
>> the
>>>>> capability
>>>>>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing
>>>>> found
>>>>>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the
>>>>>>>>> capabilities
>>>>>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the
>> mixer.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> This
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it,
>>> their
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> SX-1
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>>>>> product
>>>>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..
>>>>>>>>> I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a
very
>>>>> cool
>>>>>>>>>> DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers
>> based
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> DAW,

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for
newer
>>>>>>>> faster
>>>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>>>>>> already..I
>>>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on
>>>>>>>> www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k
>>>>>>>> converters..
>>>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> up
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
>>> Orginal
>>>>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that
if
>>> they
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> sink
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
>>> ssound..
>>>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
>>> Is
>>>>>>>> it
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
>>>>> jsut
>>>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What
I
>>> mean
>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> ,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save
up
>>> for
>>>>>>>> HD..
>>>>>>>>>

all hoped Paris would have continued to be. I would love to see something come to market, but I doubt it will happen. I gotta tell you that is a vary hard market to tap in to. There too many cheap products out their, it's enough to make your head swim. Just think about going to GC and all the options there are, Yamaha, Roland, Korg, akai, Alesis, Mackie, Zoom, Fostex, Tascam, RME, Frontier Designs, ProTools, it goes on and on. It's really hard to get the attention of people. Paris was the best chance of that happening, and the companies where stupid. I'm really not sure the market for a integrated system like Paris under say 6K is big enough to work.

The problem with companies like Mackie, is they are too greedy! I was sitting with LL Cool J the morning Mackie unveiled the Mackie d8b. First, they talked a lot of shit about what it could do, what it was going to be able to do , what the target price was, and when it would be available. They only got it to pass audio that morning, they couldn't even really demo it. it took them over two years to really get it out and get right, and I'm not sure it was ever right??? it was a lot of hype, over priced and a big disappointment to many.

They wanted \$70,000.00 Just to open a dealership for the Mackie d8b!!! That was Cash up front! That is not to sell anything else Mackie, to do that that would have been another \$30,000.00 to carry the rest of their line.

They don't want Audio guys selling their stuff, they want mass market dealers like GC. The days of Greg Mackie selling quality mixers at a reasonable price are over. Mackie gear has never gone down in price, even when it becomes obsolete. Mackie has gone totally corporate, there are no real bargains with Mackie, even though they have cut their cost by manufacturing in China.

With a company like Mackie it's all about the bottom line, and the American dollar. If they did come out with something like Paris, I guaranty you it would be over priced just like their current digital mixers. I like Mackie, but they would be out of reach of the mid level you speak of.

I don't think Mackie would be the right company to do a mid priced DAW. The morning Mackie showed the d8b I spoked to Greg Mackie. I told him he should think about making the d8b a total solution. I suggested adding a hard drive to record to, since it was a PC mobo inside the thing. I also suggested a CD burner with mastering software, he said he would think about work on another product to go along with the d8b. Instead of incorporating it in to the d8b, that product turned out to be their HD recorder. Mackie is all about slicing it and dicing it, and sell ing you the next wiz bang box. They don't want to sell a total solution to the private studios, there's more money in the next box.

I also told him that the biggest problem with digital mixer at that time was not enough I/Os, and that he should consider creating break out boxes with additional I/Os for the d8b, he thought it was a dumb idea. The bigger studios I went to, all wanted an 02r with 100+ inputs. That still has not

been addressed in a reasonably priced digital mixer. Their solution, sell you two digital mixers and all the extra proprietary stuff to hook them up\$\$\$

People tried to get Greg Mackie interested in buying Paris from EMU, including me, but he bought Soundscape instead.

To sum it up, everybody wants something different and there are already too many choices out there, I'm not sure a Mid priced DAW could do good. Price is a factor. The companies know they can sell more systems to the bedroom guitarist than they can to a small studio. It's less cost and a bigger market and more money for them to sell the cheap native system stuff. It was vary hard to get people to believe in a system like Paris back then, now I think it would be almost impossible. It's Harder to sell a good mid priced DAW than it looks!

I know that Paris is not the best DAW for work flow for some people anymore, but when combined with a second computer with the latest software, Paris is still a great choice, especially for the money.

James

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
>Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>
>Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there has
no
> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>
>I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k), DP(699)
&
>Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will yield pro
>results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture other
than
>Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost 6 years
>since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about Soundscape..
>
>My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product that
served
>the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point was revolutionary.
> AND That's the point..
>
>Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system, your only
>other alternative is do a native system..Again, I'm not saying that native's

>are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP DAW..Even more,

>it's a known fact that, if you were to build your native system up to Pro standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually come to an >PT HD system.

>There has to be a manufacturer that will stand up and fill in the gap between >PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??

>

>Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:

>-The Mackie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also had the capability >to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool editing found >in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the capabilities >to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for the mixer.

This

>would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried it, their SX-1 >was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was an Ensoniq/EMU product >first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..

>I still hoping that the Yamaha/Steinberg marriage would yield a very cool >DM2000 meets Nuendo or 02R-96 meets Cubase sx . All in one units..

>

>As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers based DAW, >we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for newer faster >Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough already..I >say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress again..)

>

>

>I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on www.gearsllutz.com >about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k converters.. >I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing up >a native DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00 Original >list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that if they sink >another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, they will have that magic sound.. >So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game?? Is it that >Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate jsut >how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What I mean is

,

>PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save up for HD..

>

>

>Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS, little software >support. do they really think that this was good move now?? I'm not even >a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAC lovers and users. If I were them, >I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ..:) Sorry.

>

>Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast market of >Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features than your current >offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing along say 3-15k >would do it..

>Okay end of rant..LaMont

>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 02:57:24 GMT

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

Oh no, Tony, you're not brainwashed at all! That's me! PARIS sounds absolutely gorgeous when hit really hard, nobody would deny that. But that's an issue of how the system works when used a certain way. That way happens to be how a generation of analog mixers worked. When someone says, "PARIS sounds amazing when I really run it into the red and mix it like an analog board with tape" I will be the last person to disagree. In fact, I'd love to mix my current (fairly trad rock) band on PARIS. All of this is true.

However, when someone says "DP is muffled in the high end" or "SX gets mushy with more than XX tracks" or "native systems sound thin" I just don't buy it. To me that DAW CD put the burden of proof on the rest of the world. Show me the proof, I'm ready to be convinced, ready to be shown wrong, but now I want proof of real sonic difference, not just a preferred way to mix.

TCB

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:

>Thad,

>

>I think most PARIS users here agree that when mixing "correctly" with about

>any DAW that the sound will be very close. Whatever "magic" people hear in

>PARIS happens when the various gain stages are pushed and pulled. Now, some

>make the claim that the fact you can push PARIS into the red in various

>areas, but not get that digital clipping "gack" (and in fact can get some

>very cool changes in character) is a flaw. Well, to each his own. I also use

>DP 4.6, and the difference in the sound of my mixes is dramatic. I always

>like my PARIS mixes better, but after all I am a brainwashed PARIS zealot,

>spreading unsubstantiated rumor and innuendo! ;>)

>

>Tony

>

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43cc0a29\$1@linux...
>>
>> Hey Dedic,
>>
>> Here's my take on this. I bought the DAW CD from Lynn What's His Name.
I
>> listened to it. I took the tests. I took them again. I had someone jumble
>> the tracks around and play them for me again. There were tiny wisp of

>> smoke
>> differences between the "best" and the "worst." On top of that, in an
ABY
>> test I can't imagine anyone doing dramatically better than a coin flip.

>> Maybe,
>> just maybe, a handful could, but I doubt even that.
>>
>> So, for me, that put the "summing bus" issue to rest. Until someone can

>> give
>> me proof, and by proof I mean ABY testing or real matmatical analysis
or
>> resulting audio files from different systems, I will believe that all

>> properly
>> written summing busses sound essentially the same. After that summing
bus
>> CD came out suddenly the critiques of summing busses moved into other

>> areas
>> like certain frequencies (that apparently weren't on the tesing CD) and

>> higher
>> track counts and acoustic instruments and so on. When someone gets me

>> evidence
>> I'll be interested again, but until then I'm happily over here using SX

>> and
>> Live. So is DJ Krush and about a million other talented people who I am

>> happy
>> to have as my company.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.

>>>
>>>Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked
>>>up to be:
>>>
>>>I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
>> ad
>>>for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>>>guess.
>>>
>>>The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>>>use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>>>compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>>>compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
>> and
>>>low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr
for
>> it
>>>- no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way.
>>>Their
>>>rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>>>Walmart approach to production.
>>>
>>>There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>>>degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,
>>>but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and

>>>heard
>>>from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>>>
>>>The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro

>>>gear,
>>>and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
>> mean
>>>the product is any better for it.
>>>
>>>I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>>>product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
>> and
>>>not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic
>>>nirvana
>>>is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work
for
>>>me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
>> a
>>>great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>>>\$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>>>when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher

>>>compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>>>nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>>>
>>>I'm off. Later.
>>>
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>>On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>><yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>>>wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> La Mont,
>>>>
>>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at
>>>> around
>>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
>> a native
>>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
>> big
>>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and
>>>> fader/FX
>>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
>> then
>>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here.
I'm
>>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
>> in
>>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and

>>>> EQ's.
>>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
>> a while
>>>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now
I
>> don't
>>>> even think twice.
>>>>
>>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>>
>>>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>>>>
>>>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
>> a little
>>>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks,

>>>> vocal
>>>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks.

>>>> They've
>>>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog
>>>> processors
>>>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>>>> mix.....and
>>>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
>> and
>>>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
>> feel
>>>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
>> do
>>>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same
if
>> I
>>>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
>> though
>>>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>>>
>>>> Deej
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpo@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> hey Detric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear
the
>>>>> difference
>>>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>>>>> version
>>>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So,
they
>>>> did
>>>>> soemthing.
>>>>>
>>>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>>>> floating
>>>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and
down
>>>> the
>>>>> audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
>> point.
>>>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summing with high track
>>>>> counts.
>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
>> mixer
>>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased

>>>>> productivity
>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>>
>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-mc.htm
>>>>>
>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>>
>>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right
with
>>>> a
>>>>> 64
>>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in
the
>> tool
>>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
>> but
>>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>>
>>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit

>>>>> (assuming
>>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>>>> but
>>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedic
>>>>>
>>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I
was
>>>> using
>>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm
>>>>>>
>>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with
a
>> moose
>>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Mytek's or
>>>>>> Lavry's
>>>>> for
>>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>>>> I
>>>>> might
>>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you

>>>>>>> need
>>>>> what
>>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer

>>>>>>> buddies
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so

>>>>>>> ago.
>>>>> They
>>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us
all
>>>> is
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
>> the
>>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
>> agreed
>>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
>> out

>>>>> having
>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "treadmill" if you will. I've
>> been
>>>>>> on
>>>>>> that treadmill since 97, and as I look back on how many great working
>>>>> system
>>>>>> setups I've destroyed due because I was trying to play the CPU speed
>>>>> game.
>>>>>> I've lost decent paying mixing and production jobs because my systems
>>>>> were
>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster CPU
and
>>>> OS..
>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
>> OS9
>>>>> that's
>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se.. Stable
>>>>> stable
>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual

>>>>>>> 867s
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX.. Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>>>> due
>>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred
our
>>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>>>> Radar
>>>>>>> with the yammy digital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand
a
>> solid
>>>>>>> working
>>>>>>> system, that you do not have to make excuses to yourself and the

>>>>>>> client..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Dedic may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
>> dsp
>>>>> system
>>>>>>>> maybe a daunting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>>>> (Phonic
>>>>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are
>>>>>>>> astounding
>>>>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>>>>> LaMont

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting
off
>>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not
>>>>>>>> productive..2)
>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much
less
>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low
end
>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that
and
>>>>> an
>>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
>> \$1000.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you

>>>>>>>> need
>>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
>> of
>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle,

>>>>>>>> they're
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
>> of
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based

>>>>>>>> systems.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS
and
>>>>> it
>>>>>>>> was a noticeable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished,
>>>>>>>> broken
>>>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
>> just
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
>> the
>>>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
>> Close,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate
DSP
>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native

>>>>>>>> system
>>>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but

>>>>>>>> using
>>>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating

>>>>>>>> system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS

>>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the
>>>>>>> transition
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>>>> system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the
>>>>>>> software
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and
>>>>>>> computer
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the
>>>>>>> upgrade
>>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad
>>>>>>> PowerMac
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra
RAM
>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>>>> third
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten

>>>>>>> years.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>>>> 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
>> may
>>>>> vary.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the
need
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
>> with
>>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
>> video
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>>>> cost.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the
>> native
>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a
>>>>>>>> hardware-limited
>>>>> DSP
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five
>>>>>>>> years,
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
>> buying
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading
>>>>>>>> everything
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>>> environment..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my
>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>>>> Logic
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog

>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>>> If
>>>>> I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I
can
>>>> get
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle

>>>>>>> part
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
>> to
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>>>> users
>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
>> person
>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
>> they
>>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
>> goes
>>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a
>>>>>>>> ProTools
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>>>> with
>>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
>> and
>>>>> truth
>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot
to
>> be
>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer,
a
>> MOTU
>>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
>> moving
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
>> really
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around
long
>>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS.

>>>>>>>> Even
>>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
>> CPUs

>>>>> are
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just

>>>>>>>>> getting
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
>>>> money
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or

>>>>>>>>> DSP).
>>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a

>>>>>>>>> five
>>>>> year
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be
>>>>>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC,

>>>>>>>>> probably
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
>>>>> say.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand

>>>>>>>>> into
>>>>>>>>> more
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the

>>>>>>>>> market.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to
>> go
>>>>>>>>> with
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.

>>>>> 6 years
>>>>>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a
>>>>>>>>>> product
>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> served
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point
>>>> was
>>>>>>> revolutionary.
>>>>>>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system,
>> your
>>>>>>> only
>>>>>>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying
>>>> that
>>>>>>> naitive's
>>>>>>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP
>>>>>>>>>> DAW..Even
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> more,
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> it's a knwon fact that, if you wew to build your naitive system
>>>> up
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Pro
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually
>> come
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>>>>>>> There has to be a manufactuer that will stand up and fill in
the
>>>>> gap
>>>>>>>>>> between
>>>>>>>>>> PT HD & the Naitives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>>>>>> -The MAckie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also
had

>>>>>>>>>> www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k
>>>>>>>>>> converters..
>>>>>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into

>>>>>>>>>> "dressing
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> up
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for
>>>>>>>>>> (2,700.00
>>>>> Original
>>>>>>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that
>> if
>>>>> they
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> sink
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
>>>> ssound..
>>>>>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
>>>>> Is
>>>>>>>>>> it
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can

>>>>>>>>>> dictate
>>>>>>> jsut
>>>>>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What
>> I
>>>> mean
>>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> ,
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> PT LE is just enough to get frustrated to only dream and save
>> up
>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>> HD..
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS,

>>>>>>>>>> little
>>>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now??

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 04:25:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Thad,

I hear ya. I did quite a few summing tests between various DAWs and while there were technical differences between a couple, there were few audible differences. I haven't listened to the DAWSUM sampler in a while, but found the same thing you did at the time. My own tests yielded similar results for the DAWs I was able to include.

I found it very interesting to read recently in one of the tech/electronic music mags about a DJ who remixed for major artists (Madonna for one?) on nothing but his Kurzweil K2500. No outboard gear, no console, no DAW, nothing. Just one keyboard workstation. He used the onboard sampler to record, edit, mix, along with onboard compression, reverb, EQ, etc - "heresy I say, stone him for breaking every rule in the book!". He had four or five major/superstar acts on his credit list before he bought a computer with, I think, Logic. Still no SSL, Neve, or outboard Lexicons or LA2As. Granted, that's a specific market that such a sound works when done well. And of course recording and mixing a folk, classical or jazz record on a keyboard workstation would be ill advised, but even that could be done if so desired. Still, I was impressed and rather humbled. He made perhaps the simplest "studio" work very effectively at a very high and very successful level.

That doesn't diminish the value of quality gear, but it just goes to show that success is more about carving your own niche by doing something interesting that people want and being diligent with it, than doing it the way everyone expects us to hoping to attract success.

Regards,
Dedric

On 1/16/06 3:03 PM, in article 43cc0a29\$1@linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
> Hey Dedric,
>
> Here's my take on this. I bought the DAW CD from Lynn What's His Name. I
> listened to it. I took the tests. I took them again. I had someone jumble
> the tracks around and play them for me again. There were tiny wisp of smoke
> differences between the "best" and the "worst." On top of that, in an ABY
> test I can't imagine anyone doing dramatically better than a coin flip. Maybe,
> just maybe, a handful could, but I doubt even that.
>
> So, for me, that put the "summing bus" issue to rest. Until someone can give

> me proof, and by proof I mean ABY testing or real matmatcal analysis or
> resulting audio files from different systems, I will believe that all properly
> written summing busses sound essentially the same. After that summing bus
> CD came out suddenly the critiques of summing busses moved into other areas
> like certain frequencies (that apparently weren't on the tesing CD) and higher
> track counts and acoustic instruments and so on. When someone gets me evidence
> I'll be interested again, but until then I'm happily over here using SX and
> Live. So is DJ Krush and about a million other talented people who I am happy
> to have as my company.

>

> TCB

>

> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>> I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.

>>

>> Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked
>> up to be:

>>

>> I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
> ad

>> for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>> guess.

>>

>> The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>> use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>> compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>> compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
> and

>> low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr for
> it

>> - no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way. Their
>> rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>> Walmart approach to production.

>>

>> There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>> degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,
>> but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and heard
>> from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.

>>

>> The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro gear,
>> and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
> mean

>> the product is any better for it.

>>

>> I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>> product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
> and

>> not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic nirvana

>> is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work for
>> me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
> a
>> great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>> \$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>> when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>> compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>> nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>>
>> I'm off. Later.
>>
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>> wrote:
>>
>>>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 05:17:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cool. I get what you were saying now.

Tony

On 1/16/06 8:57 PM, in article 43cc4f04\$1@linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com>
wrote:

>
> Oh no, Tony, you're not brainwashed at all! That's me! PARIS sounds absolutely
> gorgeous when hit really hard, nobody would deny that. But that's an issue
> of how the system works when used a certain way. That way happens to be how
> a generation of analog mixers worked. When someone says, "PARIS sounds amazing
> when I really run it into the red and mix it like an analog board with tape"
> I will be the last person to disagree. In fact, I'd love to mix my current
> (fairly trad rock) band on PARIS. All of this is true.
>
> However, when someone says "DP is muffled in the high end" or "SX gets mushy
> with more than XX tracks" or "native systems sound thin" I just don't buy
> it. To me that DAW CD put the burden of proof on the rest of the world. Show
> me the proof, I'm ready to be convinced, ready to be shown wrong, but now
> I want proof of real sonic difference, not just a preferred way to mix.
>
> TCB
>

> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>> Thad,
>>
>> I think most PARIS users here agree that when mixing "correctly" with about
>
>> any DAW that the sound will be very close. Whatever "magic" people hear
> in
>> PARIS happens when the various gain stages are pushed and pulled. Now, some
>
>> make the claim that the fact you can push PARIS into the red in various
>
>> areas, but not get that digital clipping "gack" (and in fact can get some
>
>> very cool changes in character) is a flaw. Well, to each his own. I also
> use
>> DP 4.6, and the difference in the sound of my mixes is dramatic. I always
>
>> like my PARIS mixes better, but after all I am a brainwashed PARIS zealot,
>
>> spreading unsubstantiated rumor and innuendo! ;>)
>>
>> Tony
>>
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43cc0a29\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Hey Dedic,
>>>
>>> Here's my take on this. I bought the DAW CD from Lynn What's His Name.
> I
>>> listened to it. I took the tests. I took them again. I had someone jumble
>>> the tracks around and play them for me again. There were tiny wisp of
>
>>> smoke
>>> differences between the "best" and the "worst." On top of that, in an
> ABY
>>> test I can't imagine anyone doing dramatically better than a coin flip.
>
>>> Maybe,
>>> just maybe, a handful could, but I doubt even that.
>>>
>>> So, for me, that put the "summing bus" issue to rest. Until someone can
>
>>> give
>>> me proof, and by proof I mean ABY testing or real matmatrical analysis
> or
>>> resulting audio files from different systems, I will believe that all
>

>>> properly
>>> written summing busses sound essentially the same. After that summing
> bus
>>> CD came out suddenly the critiques of summing busses moved into other
>
>>> areas
>>> like certain frequencies (that apparently weren't on the tesing CD) and
>
>>> higher
>>> track counts and acoustic instruments and so on. When someone gets me
>
>>> evidence
>>> I'll be interested again, but until then I'm happily over here using SX
>
>>> and
>>> Live. So is DJ Krush and about a million other talented people who I am
>
>>> happy
>>> to have as my company.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.
>>>>
>>>> Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked
>>>> up to be:
>>>>
>>>> I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
>>> ad
>>>> for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>>>> guess.
>>>>
>>>> The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>>>> use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>>>> compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>>>> compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
>>> and
>>>> low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr
> for
>>> it
>>>> - no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way.
>>>> Their
>>>> rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>>>> Walmart approach to production.
>>>>
>>>> There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>>>> degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,

>>>> but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and
>
>>>> heard
>>>> from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>>>>
>>>> The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro
>
>>>> gear,
>>>> and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
>>> mean
>>>> the product is any better for it.
>>>>
>>>> I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>>>> product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
>>> and
>>>> not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic
>>>> nirvana
>>>> is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work
> for
>>>> me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
>>> a
>>>> great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>>>> \$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>>>> when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>>>> compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>>>> nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>>>>
>>>> I'm off. Later.
>>>>
>>>> Detric
>>>>
>>>> On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>> <yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> La Mont,
>>>>>
>>>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at
>>>>> around
>>>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
>>>> a native
>>>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
>>>> big
>>>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and
>>>>> fader/FX
>>>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
>>>> then

>>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here.
> I'm
>>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
>>> in
>>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and
>
>>>> EQ's.
>>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
>>> a while
>>>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now
> I
>>> don't
>>>> even think twice.
>>>>
>>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>>
>>>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>>>>
>>>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
>>> a little
>>>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks,
>
>>>> vocal
>>>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks.
>>>> They've
>>>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog
>>>> processors
>>>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>>>> mix.....and
>>>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
>>> and
>>>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
>>> feel
>>>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
>>> do
>>>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same
> if
>>> I
>>>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
>>> though
>>>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>>>
>>>> Deej
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdp@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> hey Dedric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear

> the
>>>>> difference
>>>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>>>>> version
>>>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So,
> they
>>>>> did
>>>>> soemthing.
>>>>>
>>>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>>>> floating
>>>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and
> down
>>>>> the
>>>>> audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
>>> point.
>>>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>>>>> counts.
>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
>>> mixer
>>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased
>>>>>> productivity
>>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m c.htm
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right
> with
>>>>>> a
>>>>>>> 64
>>>>>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in
> the

>>> tool
>>>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
>>> but
>>>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit
>
>>>>>> (assuming
>>>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>>>>> but
>>>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>> Dedic
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I
> was
>>>>> using
>>>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with
> a
>>> moose
>>>>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or
>>>>>>>> Lavry's
>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>>>>>> I
>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
>
>>>>>>>>>> need
>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this

>>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer
>
>>>>>>> buddies
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so
>
>>>>>>> ago.
>>>>>> They
>>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us
> all
>>>>> is
>>>>>> that
>>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
>>> the
>>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>>>>> that
>>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
>>> agreed
>>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
>>> out
>>>>>> having
>>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've
>>> been
>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>>>>>> system
>>>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
>>>>>> game.
>>>>>>> I've lost decnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems
>>>>>>> were
>>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu
> and
>>>>> OS..
>>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
>>> OS9
>>>>>> that's
>>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>>>>>> stable
>>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual
>
>>>>>>>> 867s
>>>>>>> to

>>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>>>> due
>>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred
> our
>>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>>>> Radar
>>>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand
> a
>>> solid
>>>>>>> working
>>>>>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the
>
>>>>>>> client..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
>>> dsp
>>>>> system
>>>>>>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>>>> (Phonic
>>>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are
>>>>>>> astounding
>>>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting
> off
>>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not
>>>>>>>> productive..2)
>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much
> less
>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low
> end
>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that
> and

>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
>>> \$1000.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
>
>>>>>>>>> need
>>>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
>>> of
>>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle,
>
>>>>>>>>> they're
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
>>> of
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based
>
>>>>>>>>> systems.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS
> and
>>>>> it
>>>>>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished,
>>>>>>>>> broken
>>>>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
>>> just
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware

>>>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
>>> the
>>>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
>>> Close,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate
> DSP
>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native
>
>>>>>>>> system
>>>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but
>
>>>>>>>> using
>>>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating
>
>>>>>>>> system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS
>
>>>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the
>>>>>>>> transition
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>>>>> system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the
>>>>>>>> software
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and
>>>>>>>> computer
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the
>>>>>>>> upgrade
>>>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad

>>>>>>>> PowerMac
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra
> RAM
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>>>>> third
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten
>
>>>>>>>> years.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>>>>> 10K.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
>>> may
>>>>>> vary.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the
> need
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
>>> with
>>>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
>>> video
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>>>>> cost.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and the
>>> native
>>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a
>>>>>>>>> hardware-limited
>>>>>> DSP
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five
>>>>>>>>> years,
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
>>> buying
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading
>>>>>>>> everything
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>>> environment..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my
>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>>>>> Logic
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>>>> If
>>>>>> I
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I
> can
>>>>> get
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle
>
>>>>>>>> part
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutiois is that
>>>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>>>>>>>> users
>>>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
>>> person
>>>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
>>> they
>>>>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
>>> goes
>>>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a
>>>>>>>>> ProTools
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>>>>>>>>> with
>>>>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
>>> and
>>>>>>>>> truth
>>>>>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot
> to
>>> be
>>>>>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer,
> a
>>> MOTU
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
>>> moving
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
>>> really
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm

>>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around
> long
>>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS.
>
>>>>>>>> Even
>>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
>>> CPUs
>>>>> are
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just
>
>>>>>>>>>> getting
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
>>>>> money
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or
>
>>>>>>>>>>>> DSP).
>>>>>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a
>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> five
>>>>>>>>>> year
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be

>>>>>>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC,
>
>>>>>>>>>> probably
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
>>>>> say.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand
>
>>>>>>>>>> into
>>>>>> more
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the
>
>>>>>>>>>> market.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to
>>> go
>>>>>> with
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty
>>> of
>>>>>> PPC
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac
>
>>>>>>>>>> which
>>>>>>> has
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll
>
>>>>>>>>>> continue
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:

>>>>>>>>> more,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> it's a known fact that, if you were to build your native system
>>>>> up
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Pro
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> standards (AD/DA converters,mixer,DSP FX cards) you'd actually
>>> come
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> PT HD system.
>>>>>>>>> There has to be a manufacturer that will stand up and fill in
> the
>>>>> gap
>>>>>>>> between
>>>>>>>>> PT HD & the Natives. Any company has the balls??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Today my dream DAW would come from Mackie:
>>>>>>>>> -The Mackie DBX digital mixer (Dual touch screens)that also
> had
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> capability
>>>>>>>>> to record up to 128 24/96 audio tracks. Using the same cool
>
>>>>>>>>>> editing
>>>>>>>>> found
>>>>>>>>>> in their earlier Hard disk recorder MDR2496. The mix has the
>>>>>>>>>> capabilities
>>>>>>>>>> to add up to 3or 4 UAD cards, as well as third party FX for
> the
>>>>> mixer.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> This
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> would be a ground breaking product. Even though Tascam tried
> it,
>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> SX-1
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> was cool, but was too limited. Actually, the SA-1 was a
>>>>>>>>>>>> Ensoniq/EMU
>>>>>>>>>>>> product
>>>>>>>>>>>>> first, then made it's was over to Tascam..I digress..

Now, Thad, I'll be happy to ship/FTP you a project(50-24bit wav files) on /DVD for you to mix or just bring up with out mixing in SX. .Then, I want you bring those same files into Paris, or PT HD/LE..Then, if you will, report your auditory findings..:)

Dedric, I think you think that I'm saying that one app is superior to another..Rather, I'm saying "in different kinds of music genres, one app suites the music more than others. Not, saying that you can't acheive great results from any DAW, but rather, some forms of music is easier to "MIX" in than others.. That's all I'm saying. FOr example. To me, I would not use Paris for "critical film scoring" work. To me, Nuendo/SX sound quality, with it's wide, spacious, audio quality is just the right audio foot print for the project. Pro-Tools could be next and so could DP/Motus interfaces..But, the Paris sound, would be too "colored" where you need the spearation, wide deep sound to hear evey element of a score. also, commerical work as well..

But, Paris would and is atop of my DAW food chain for mixing ROCK, HIP/HOP, R&B, Gospel. Paris's Agressive crunch and it's colored sound when pushed is alone in this dept followed by PT/with apogeos Rosettas /AD/DA16x.. Again, this is my world real world findings, not some internet forum talk..

Sure, give me my MPC-2000& vs2480, and I'll get killer results everytime that folks swear I used a DAW on.

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

>

>Hey Dedric,

>

>Here's my take on this. I bought the DAW CD from Lynn What's His Name. I

>listened to it. I took the tests. I took them again. I had someone jumble

>the tracks around and play them for me again. There were tiny wisp of smoke

>differences between the "best" and the "worst." On top of that, in an ABY

>test I can't imagine anyone doing dramatically better than a coin flip.

Maybe,

>just maybe, a handful could, but I doubt even that.

>

>So, for me, that put the "summing bus" issue to rest. Until someone can give

>me proof, and by proof I mean ABY testing or real matmatrical analysis or

>resulting audio files from different systems, I will believe that all properly

>written summing busses sound essentially the same. After that summing bus

>CD came out suddenly the critiques of summing busses moved into other areas

>like certain frequencies (that apparently weren't on the tesing CD) and

higher

>track counts and acoustic instruments and so on. When someone gets me evidence
>I'll be interested again, but until then I'm happily over here using SX
and
>Live. So is DJ Krush and about a million other talented people who I am
happy
>to have as my company.
>
>TCB
>
>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.
>>
>>Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked
>>up to be:
>>
>>I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
>ad
>>for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>>guess.
>>
>>The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>>use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>>compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>>compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
>and
>>low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr for
>it
>>- no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way. Their
>>rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>>Walmart approach to production.
>>
>>There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>>degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,
>>but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and heard
>>from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>>
>>The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro
gear,
>>and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
>mean
>>the product is any better for it.
>>
>>I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>>product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
>and
>>not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic nirvana
>>is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work for
>>me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating

>a
>>great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>>\$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>>when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>>compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>>nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>>
>>I'm off. Later.
>>
>>Dedric
>>
>>On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.net>
>>wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> La Mont,
>>>
>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around
>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
>a native
>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
>big
>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX
>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
>then
>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here.
I'm
>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
>in
>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and
EQ's.
>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
>a while
>>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I
>don't
>>> even think twice.
>>>
>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>
>>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>>>
>>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
>a little
>>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks,
vocal
>>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've
>>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors
>>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the

>>> mix.....and
>>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
>and
>>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
>feel
>>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
>do
>>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if
>I
>>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
>though
>>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>>
>>> Deej
>>>
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpo@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> hey Detric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the
>>>> difference
>>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>>>> version
>>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So, they
>>> did
>>>> soemthing.
>>>>
>>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>>> floating
>>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and down
>>> the
>>>> audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
>point.
>>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>>>> counts.
>>>> LaMont
>>>>
>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
>mixer
>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>>
>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m c.htm
>>>>>
>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>

>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>
>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>
>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right with
>>> a
>>>> 64
>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
>tool
>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
>but
>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>
>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit
(assuming
>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>>> but
>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedic
>>>>
>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
>>> using
>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with
>a
>moose
>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>>>> for
>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>>> I
>>>> might
>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>
>>>>> ;o)

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
need
>>>> what
>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer buddies
>>>>>> of
>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so
ago.
>>>> They
>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>>> is
>>>> that
>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
>the
>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>>> that
>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
>agreed
>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
>out
>>>> having
>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've
>been
>>>>>> on
>>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>>>> system
>>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
>>> game.
>>>>>> I've lost dectnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems
>>>> were
>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
>>> OS..
>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
>OS9
>>>> that's
>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>>>> stable
>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>

>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual
867s
>>>> to
>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>>> due
>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred
our
>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>>> Radar
>>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a
>solid
>>>>>> working
>>>>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the
client..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
>dsp
>>>> system
>>>>>>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>>> (Phonic
>>>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>>>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting
off
>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much less
>>>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low
end
>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and
>>> an
>>>>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
>\$1000.

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
>>>>>>> need
>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
>of
>>>> this
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle,
>they're
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
>of
>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
>>>> it
>>>>>>> was a noticeable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
>just
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
>the
>>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
>Close,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate DSP
>>>> for
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native system
>>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but using
>>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS pretty
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>>> system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>>> third
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten years.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>>> 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
>may
>>>> vary.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the need
>>>> to

>>>>>>
>>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
>with
>>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
>video
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>>> cost.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the
>native
>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>>>> DSP
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
>buying
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>>>> environment..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>>> Logic
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>> If

>>>> I
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
>>> get
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle
part
>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
>to
>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>>> users
>>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
>person
>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
>they
>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>>> to
>>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
>goes
>>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>>> with
>>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
>and

>>>> truth
>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to
>be
>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a
>MOTU
>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
>moving
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
>really
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around long
>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS.
Even
>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
>CPUs
>>>> are
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just
getting
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
>>> money

>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>>>>>> has
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
>>> DP(699)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> &
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good naitive systems that will
>yield
>>>>>>> pro
>>>>>>>> results. However, I can't belive thatthere is not one manufacture
>>>> other
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> than
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost
>>>> 6 years
>>>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a product
>>>> that
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> served
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the "Middle ground" studio. Now, looking back, it's price point
>>>> was
>>>>>> revolutionary.
>>>>>>>> AND That's the point..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Today, if you're shelling out at least 10k for a PT HD system,
>your
>>>>>>> only
>>>>>>>> other alternative is do a naitive system..Again, I'm not saying
>>>> that
>>>>>>>> naitive's
>>>>>>>> are bad, but we all know that there's nothing like a cool DSP
>>>>>>>> DAW..Even
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> As things stands now in our current state of Personal computers
>>> based
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> DAW,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> we really have not had any ground breaking technology save for
>newer
>>>>>>> faster
>>>>>>>>> Cpus.. Inwhich, I for one am tired of chasing the speed demon.Enough
>>>>>>> already..I
>>>>>>>>> say this and I work as a IT Network Consultant.. Okay :) i digress
>>>>>>>>> again..:)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I guess this post grew out of neverending post over on
>>>>>>>>>> www.gearslutz.com
>>>>>>>>>> about Ribbon mics, Summing buss's, 5k mics, 4k pre-amps, 4k
>>>>>>>>>> converters..
>>>>>>>>>> I'm thinking, why do I want to keep sinking good money into "dressing
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> up
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> a naitive DAW to try to sound as good as Paris does for (2,700.00
>>>> Orginal
>>>>>>>>>>> list)??? Those guys, bless their hearts are into dreaming that
>if
>>>> they
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> sink
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> another 5-10k in analoge summing gear, tey will have that magic
>>> ssound..
>>>>>>>>>>>>> So, I'm thinkink, 'Why have we gone backwards in this dAW game??
>>>> Is
>>>>>>>> it
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Digi has such a strangle hold on the industry,that they can dictate
>>>>>>>> jsut
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> how much cool stuff reaches the lowered of the spectrum. What
>I
>>> mean
>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Not Since Paris, There Has been no Pro (Mid) DSPDAW
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 20:45:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lamont,

Bingo - you just stated that Nuendo exhibits a wide and spacious (I would add clear) sound, where Paris is colored.
That's what I want in a DAW - transparent/clear. I don't want colored.
There are other ways to create color, but once it's in a colored mix engine, there is no way to take it back out. That's what I found with Paris - orchestral work and spacious synth pads never sounded righ. Yes, it sounds great for rock, and many other sytles, but in general I prefer a transparent starting point, creating attitude on a track by track basis as needed.
I know that's a departure from the audio industry's engineering approach to using consoles for their characterm almost as a mantra rather than understanding the real reason: we developed those expectations and "standards" if you will, because the formats weren't absolutely transparent - we had no choice - make the tool work for what it does, and find something else when the requirements change. However, I'm a purist, but without the unlimited budget to appease my ears. I always hated having to factor in any noise floor from analog consoles, or tape. We went to a lot of trouble and expense trying to keep analog gear (which does have very good merits for character and color) sounding as clear as possible, and now that we have clear digital (albeit not as clear as DSD or very high sample rates would), we spend the same amount of time trying to put it all back. Doesn't that sound just a little silly? I chalk it up to human nature. But hearing a friend of mine in a well known audio engineering school talk, you would think that these are standards that can't be changed without a unanimous UN resolution.

I'll also be happy to take you up on your offer to Thad (if you will extend that offer to me) to send a DVD to mix in Nuendo. If you are serious, email me at: [dedric at echomg dot com](mailto:dedric@echomg.com). You can include your best PTHD and/or Paris mixes of the same tracks - I'll see if I can match them, even if we don't have equivalent plugins.

For the record, regardless of who you were addressing, I can hear the difference between a DCS converter, Mytek and Cransesong, and can hear the differences at very minute levels - including between Paris and other DAWs. But, your statement that it is a known fact that software "has a sound" is misleading, if not incorrect. Software does not have a sound beyond the accuracy of passing through what the converters interpret.

What you are referring to are differences in how audio files are managed in specific situations, and how accurate that is - the ongoing DAW debate is really about what is the "standard" or reference method. So far there isn't one that anyone can agree on: float vs. fixed, DSD vs. PCM, etc, etc. For example:

What Lynn Fuston's DAWSUM sampler shows is that actual summing of 24-bit audio files (the act of adding at a given level) is identical in most DAWs that have a known, invariant, direct path. This doesn't mean 32-bit float and 48-bit fixed are identical in all mathematical uses, just that 22-24 bits of dynamic range, added together, are. Any difference between DAWs in this test would indicate an error in pass through capability. The lowest levels are where the bit depth differences occur - with 24-bit files in unity gain summing, there will be nothing to use beyond a 24-bit dynamic range. At one time I found Paris was boosting gain exponentially as you go down. I don't have Paris to confirm or recreate this (Sakis thinks we resolved that issue, but I don't ever recall doing so).

**Also, interestingly, from Lynn's CD, Nuendo, Fairlight, Pyramix, Samplitude and PTHD mixes cancel completely through -144dB, although with very very small correlation differences between each (i.e. not one in particular - this could be a slight variance in phase alignment in the test), but Paris doesn't cancel with either - it exhibits differences as high as -82dB. I first thought the Paris mix sounded wider, but when comparing to Nuendo, and PTHD, the center of the mix sounded lower in volume, making the edges sound wider - with a very slight bit of phase oddity. The center of Nuendo sounded more defined, just as wide, just not as loud on the edges. Paris almost sucked the center very slightly to my ears, where Nuendo and PTHD pushed it a bit more. All of this can be subjective, and on different monitors, the results could vary.

That's my take on it in more than a nutshell, and with more detail and comparative listening than forum talk.

Regards,
Dedric

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:43cd3715\$1@linux...

>
> Now, Thad, I'll be happy to ship/FTP you a project(50-24bit wav files) on
> /DVD for you to mix or just bring up with out mixing in SX. .Then, I want
> you bring those same files into Paris, or PT HD/LE..Then, if you will,
> report
> your auditory findings...)
>
> Dedric, I think you think that I'm saying that one app is superior to
> another..Rather,
> I'm saying "in different kinds of music genres, one app suites the music

> more than others. Not, saying that you can't achieve great results from
> any
> DAW, but rather, some forms of music is easier to "MIX" in than others..
> That's all I'm saying. For example. To me, I would not use Paris for
> "critical
> film scoring" work. To me, Nuendo/SX sound quality, with it's wide,
> spacious,
> audio quality is just the right audio footprint for the project.
> Pro-Tools could be next and so could DP/Motus interfaces..But, the Paris
> sound, would be too "colored" where you need the separation, wide deep
> sound
> to hear every element of a score. also, commercial work as well..
>
> But, Paris would and is atop of my DAW food chain for mixing ROCK,
> HIP/HOP,
> R&B, Gospel. Paris's Aggressive crunch and it's colored sound when pushed
> is alone in this dept followed by PT/with apogees Rosettas /AD/DA16x..
> Again, this is my world real world findings, not some internet forum
> talk..
>
> Sure, give me my MPC-2000& vs2480, and I'll get killer results everytime
> that folks swear I used a DAW on.
>
>
>
>
>
>
> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hey Dedic,
>>
>>Here's my take on this. I bought the DAW CD from Lynn What's His Name. I
>>listened to it. I took the tests. I took them again. I had someone jumble
>>the tracks around and play them for me again. There were tiny wisps of
>>smoke
>>differences between the "best" and the "worst." On top of that, in an ABY
>>test I can't imagine anyone doing dramatically better than a coin flip.
> Maybe,
>>just maybe, a handful could, but I doubt even that.
>>
>>So, for me, that put the "summing bus" issue to rest. Until someone can
> give
>>me proof, and by proof I mean ABY testing or real mathematical analysis or
>>resulting audio files from different systems, I will believe that all
>>properly
>>written summing busses sound essentially the same. After that summing bus
>>CD came out suddenly the critiques of summing busses moved into other
>>areas

>>like certain frequencies (that apparently weren't on the tesing CD) and
> higher
>>track counts and acoustic instruments and so on. When someone gets me
>>evidence
>>I'll be interested again, but until then I'm happily over here using SX
> and
>>Live. So is DJ Krush and about a million other talented people who I am
> happy
>>to have as my company.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.
>>>
>>>Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's
>>>cracked
>>>up to be:
>>>
>>>I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
>>ad
>>>for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>>>guess.
>>>
>>>The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>>>use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>>>compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>>>compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
>>and
>>>low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr for
>>it
>>>- no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way.
>>>Their
>>>rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>>>Walmart approach to production.
>>>
>>>There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>>>degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very
>>>quickly,
>>>but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and
>>>heard
>>>from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>>>
>>>The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro
> gear,
>>>and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
>>mean
>>>the product is any better for it.

>>>
>>>I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>>>product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
>>and
>>>not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic
>>>nirvana
>>>is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work for
>>>me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living
>>>creating
>>a
>>>great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>>>\$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2%
>>>silkier
>>>when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>>>compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>>>nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>>>
>>>I'm off. Later.
>>>
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>>On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>><yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>>>wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> La Mont,
>>>>
>>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at
>>>> around
>>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
>>a native
>>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
>>big
>>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and
>>>> fader/FX
>>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
>>then
>>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here.
> I'm
>>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
>>in
>>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and
> EQ's.
>>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
>>a while
>>>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I
>>don't

>>>> even think twice.
>>>>
>>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>>
>>>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Love/)
>>>>
>>>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
>>a little
>>>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks,
> vocal
>>>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks.
>>>> They've
>>>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog
>>>> processors
>>>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>>>> mix.....and
>>>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
>>and
>>>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
>>feel
>>>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
>>do
>>>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same if
>>I
>>>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
>>though
>>>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>>>
>>>> Deej
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdp@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> hey Dedric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear the
>>>>> difference
>>>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>>>>> version
>>>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So,
>>>>> they
>>>> did
>>>>> soemthing.
>>>>>
>>>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>>>> floating
>>>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and
>>>>> down
>>>> the
>>>>> audio bandwidth, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain

>>point.
>>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summing with high track
>>>> counts.
>>>> LaMont
>>>>
>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
>>mixer
>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased
>>>>> productivity
>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>>
>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-mc.htm
>>>>>
>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>>
>>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right
>>>>> with
>>>> a
>>>>> 64
>>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
>>tool
>>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
>>but
>>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>>
>>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit
> (assuming
>>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the
>>>>> concept,
>>>> but
>>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Detric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"

>>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I was
>>>> using
>>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with
> a
>>moose
>>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or
>>>>>> Lavry's
>>>>> for
>>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>>>> I
>>>>> might
>>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
> need
>>>>> what
>>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer
>>>>>>> buddies
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discussion about amonth or so
> ago.
>>>>> They
>>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>>>> is
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
>>the
>>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer
>>>>>>> technology,
>>>>> that

>>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
>>agreed
>>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
>>out
>>>>> having
>>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "treadmill" if you will. I've
>>been
>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great
>>>>>>> working
>>>>> system
>>>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
>>>> game.
>>>>>>> I've lost decnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my
>>>>>>> systems
>>>>> were
>>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
>>>> OS..
>>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
>>OS9
>>>>> that's
>>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win
>>>>>>> 98se..Stable
>>>>> stable
>>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual
> 867s
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their
>>>>>>> faces
>>>>> due
>>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred
> our
>>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with
>>>>>>> Nuendo/PT
>>>>> Radar
>>>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a
>>solid
>>>>>>> working
>>>>>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the
> client..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
>>dsp
>>>>> system
>>>>>>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of

>>>>>>> China
>>>>> (Phonic
>>>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are
>>>>>>> astounding
>>>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting
> off
>>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not
>>>>>>>>> productive..2)
>>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much
>>>>>>>>> less
>>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low
> end
>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that and
>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
>>\$1000.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
> need
>>>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
>>of
>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle,
> they're
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't

>>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
>>of
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based
>>>>>>> systems.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade
>>>>>>> along
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS and
>>>>> it
>>>>>>> was a noticeable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the
>>>>>>> PARIS
>>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished,
>>>>>>> broken
>>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
>>just
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
>>the
>>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
>>Close,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate
> DSP
>>>>> for
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native
>>>>>>> system
>>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but
>>>>>>> using
>>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating
> system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS

> pretty
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the
>>>>>>> transition
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a
>>>>>>> solid
>>>>> system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the
>>>>>>> software
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and
>>>>>>> computer
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the
>>>>>>> upgrade
>>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad
>>>>>>> PowerMac
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra RAM
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>>>>> third
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten
> years.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well
>>>>>>> under
>>>>> 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
>> may
>>>>> vary.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the
>>>>>>> need
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade

>>with
>>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
>>video
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no
>>>>>>> extra
>>>>> cost.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the
>>native
>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a
>>>>>>>> hardware-limited
>>>>> DSP
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five
>>>>>>>> years,
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
>>buying
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading
>>>>>>>>> everything
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software
>>>>>>>>> development,
>>>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>>>>> environment..
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my
>>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>>>> Logic
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>>> If
>>>>> I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
>>>> get
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different
>>>>>>> manufacturers
>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle
> part
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
>>to
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic
>>>>>>> native
>>>>> users
>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
>>person
>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
>>they
>>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>>>> to
>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
>>goes
>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a
>>>>>>> ProTools
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable

>>>>>>> results.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>>>> with
>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
>>and
>>>>> truth
>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to
>>be
>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer, a
>>MOTU
>>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
>>moving
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
>>really
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around
>>>>>>>> long
>>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS.
> Even
>>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
>>CPUs
>>>>> are

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just
> getting
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
>>>> money
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or
> DSP).
>>>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a
> five
>>>>> year
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be
>>>>>>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC,
>>>>>>>>>> probably
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
>>>> say.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand
> into
>>>>> more
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the
> market.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to
>>go
>>>>> with
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty
>>of
>>>>> PPC
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac
>>>>>>>>>> which

>>>> has
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll
> continue
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris
>>>>>>>>> DAW(\$2700list)there
>>>>>>>>> has
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
>>>> DP(699)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> &
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will
>>yield
>>>>>>>>> pro
>>>>>>>>>>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one
>>>>>>>>>>> manufacture
>>>>> other
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> than
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's
>>>>>>>>>>> almost
>>>>> 6 years
>>>>>>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>>>>>>> Soundscape..
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> My Point in this post is to bring to ligh that Paris was a
>>>>>>>>>>>>> product
>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Amazon was about right. Later, other evidence came forward to disprove those, and many other known facts. That DAW CD was *evidence* that by and large all software sounds remarkably the same. Tell me the mistake in that methodology of that test, I'm interested.

I'm more than happy to take a track count that high and run it through a half dozen systems. I'll do ABY testing and also take the exported files, line them up to the sample, and flip the phase on one set. When I've done that I'll know precisely what difference the software makes in how things sound.

TCB

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
>Okay here's my take :)
>
>First, that summing CD did not tell me diddly-squat. During that time, I was
>actively using DP, Logic, Nuendo, PT, and Paris. To say that you can't "hear"
>much difference really speaks volumes.
>
>It's a known fact that "software" does have a sound. Why do folks take offense
>because someones says something they percieve to a negative, is not, but
>only a perspective on sound.
>
>And, yes, the true test of any of these DAWs is it's summing.
>Note: DP with Motu hardware renders Top-off the line results, no matter
the
>tracks count. Something magical is happening when DP is used with it's own
>manufactures audio units.
>
>Now, run DP, and use a RME interface. The sound is bland, very vanilla, gerneric.
>We don't know why, but this is just the case in our informal real world
,
>real project applications.
>
>Now, Thad, I'll be happy to ship/FTP you a project(50-24bit wav files) on
>/DVD for you to mix or just bring up with out mixing in SX. .Then, I want
>you bring those same files into Paris, or PT HD/LE..Then, if you will, report
>your auditory findings..:)
>
>Dedric, I think you think that I'm saying that one app is superior to another..Rather,
>I'm saying "in different kinds of music genres, one app suites the music
>more than others. Not, saying that you can't acheive great results from
any
>DAW, but rather, some forms of music is easier to "MIX" in than others..
>That's all I'm saying. FOr example. To me, I would not use Paris for "critical
>film scoring" work. To me, Nuendo/SX sound quality, with it's wide, spacious,

>audio quality is just the right audio foot print for the project.
>Pro-Tools could be next and so could DP/Motus interfaces..But, the Paris
>sound, would be too "colored" where you need the speparation, wide deep sound
>to hear evey element of a score. also, commerical work as well..
>
>But, Paris would and is atop of my DAW food chain for mixing ROCK, HIP/HOP,
>R&B, Gospel. Paris's Agressive crunch and it's colored sound when pushed
>is alone in this dept followed by PT/with apogeas Rosettas /AD/DA16x..
>Again, this is my world real world findings, not some internet forum talk..
>
>Sure, give me my MPC-2000& vs2480, and I'll get killer results everytime
>that folks swear I used a DAW on.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hey Dedic,
>>
>>Here's my take on this. I bought the DAW CD from Lynn What's His Name.
I
>>listened to it. I took the tests. I took them again. I had someone jumble
>>the tracks around and play them for me again. There were tiny wisp of smoke
>>differences between the "best" and the "worst." On top of that, in an ABY
>>test I can't imagine anyone doing dramatically better than a coin flip.
>Maybe,
>>just maybe, a handful could, but I doubt even that.
>>
>>So, for me, that put the "summing bus" issue to rest. Until someone can
>give
>>me proof, and by proof I mean ABY testing or real matmathical analysis or
>>resulting audio files from different systems, I will believe that all properly
>>written summing busses sound essentially the same. After that summing bus
>>CD came out suddenly the critiques of summing busses moved into other areas
>>like certain frequencies (that apparently weren't on the tesing CD) and
>higher
>>track counts and acoustic instruments and so on. When someone gets me evidence
>>I'll be interested again, but until then I'm happily over here using SX
>and
>>Live. So is DJ Krush and about a million other talented people who I am
>happy
>>to have as my company.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>>I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.
>>>
>>>Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's cracked
>>>up to be:
>>>
>>>I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
>>ad
>>>for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>>>guess.
>>>
>>>The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>>>use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>>>compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>>>compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
>>and
>>>low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr
for
>>it
>>>- no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way.
Their
>>>rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>>>Walmart approach to production.
>>>
>>>There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>>>degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very quickly,
>>>but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and
heard
>>>from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>>>
>>>The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro
>gear,
>>>and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
>>mean
>>>the product is any better for it.
>>>
>>>I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>>>product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
>>and
>>>not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic nirvana
>>>is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work
for
>>>me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living creating
>>a
>>>great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>>>\$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2% silkier
>>>when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>>>compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>>>nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.

>>>
>>>I'm off. Later.
>>>
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>>On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej" <yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>>>wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> La Mont,
>>>>
>>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at around
>>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
>>a native
>>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
>>big
>>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and fader/FX
>>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
>>then
>>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here.
>I'm
>>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
>>in
>>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and
>EQ's.
>>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
>>a while
>>>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now
I
>>don't
>>>> even think twice.
>>>>
>>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>>
>>>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>>>>
>>>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and
>>a little
>>>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks,
>vocal
>>>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks. They've
>>>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog processors
>>>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>>>> mix.....and
>>>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
>>and
>>>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
>>feel

>>>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot to
>>do
>>>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same
if
>>I
>>>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
>>though
>>>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>>>
>>>> Deej
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdp@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> hey Detric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear
the
>>>>> difference
>>>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>>>>> version
>>>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So,
they
>>>> did
>>>>> soemthing.
>>>>>
>>>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>>>> floating
>>>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and
down
>>>> the
>>>>> audio bandwidth, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
>>point.
>>>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>>>>> counts.
>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
>>mixer
>>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased productivity
>>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m c.htm
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>

>>>>>
>>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>>
>>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right
with
>>>> a
>>>>> 64
>>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in
the
>>tool
>>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
>>but
>>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>>
>>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit
>(assuming
>>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the concept,
>>>> but
>>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedic
>>>>>
>>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I
was
>>>> using
>>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with
>a
>>moose
>>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or Lavry's
>>>>> for
>>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>>>> I
>>>>> might
>>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.

>>>>>>
>>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
>need
>>>>> what
>>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer
buddies
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so
>ago.
>>>>> They
>>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us
all
>>>>> is
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
>>the
>>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer technology,
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
>>agreed
>>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
>>out
>>>>> having
>>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've
>>been
>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great working
>>>>> system
>>>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
>>>> game.
>>>>>>> I've lost dectnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my systems
>>>>> were
>>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu
and
>>>> OS..
>>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
>>OS9

>>>>> that's
>>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win 98se..Stable
>>>>> stable
>>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual
>867s
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their faces
>>>>> due
>>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred
>our
>>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with Nuendo/PT
>>>>> Radar
>>>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand
>a
>>solid
>>>>>>> working
>>>>>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the
>client..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Dedicric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
>>dsp
>>>>> system
>>>>>>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of China
>>>>> (Phonic
>>>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are astounding
>>>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting
>off
>>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not productive..2)
>>>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much
>less

>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low
>end
>>>>> a
>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that
>and
>>>>> an
>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
>>\$1000.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
>need
>>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
>>of
>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> discussion).

>>>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring a
>>>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a fast
>>>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle,
>they're
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>>>> computer-based systems.

>>>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
>>of
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based
>>>>>>>> systems.

>>>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.

>>>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade along
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS
>and
>>>>> it
>>>>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the PARIS
>>>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished, broken
>>>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
>>just
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
>>the
>>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
>>Close,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate
>DSP
>>>>> for
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native
system
>>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but
using
>>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating
>system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS
>pretty
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the transition
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a solid
>>>>> system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the software
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so the
>>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and computer
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the upgrade
>>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad PowerMac
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra
RAM
>>>> and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and some
>>>> third

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten
>years.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well under
>>>>> 10K.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
>>may
>>>>> vary.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the
need
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
>>with
>>>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation or
>>video
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no extra
>>>>> cost.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based system, you know what you have, and the
>>native
>>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a hardware-limited
>>>>> DSP
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five years,
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
>>buying
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading everything
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software development,
>>>>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>>> enviornment..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my current
>>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>>>> Logic
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>>> If
>>>>>>>> I
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I
can
>>>> get
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different manufacturers
>>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle
>part
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
>>to
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic native
>>>>>>>> users
>>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
>>person
>>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
>>they
>>>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers

>>>> to
>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
>>goes
>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a ProTools
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable results.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio, I can
>>>> with
>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
>>and
>>>>> truth
>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot
to
>>be
>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer,
a
>>MOTU
>>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a 24
>>moving
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm not
>>really
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what I'm
>>>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around
long
>>>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS.
>Even
>>>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
>>CPUs
>>>> are
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just
>getting
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend more
>>> money
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or
>DSP).
>>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not a
>five
>>>> year
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be software
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC,
probably
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so they
>>> say.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Over the next year the Mac Intel hardware choices will expand
>into
>>>> more
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> laptop and desktop choices as Intel's series of chips hit the
>market.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The roadmap is pretty much known at this point. If you want to
>>go
>>>> with
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Intel, pick your best time for the transition.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> If you want to make music using OSX right away there are plenty
>>of
>>>>> PPC
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> choices that work today, all the way up to the quad PowerMac
which
>>>>> has
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> more muscle than you probably need. Available now and they'll
>continue
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> to work after the Intel transition.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Hi Guys, Some thoughts:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Has anyone noticed that since our beloved Paris DAW(\$2700list)there
>>>>>>>>> has
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> pro DAW for under 10k??? Why??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases (\$499) Nuendo's (\$1,500), Logic(1k),
>>>> DP(699)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> &
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Sonar(\$400). There are all very good native systems that will
>>yield
>>>>>>>>> pro
>>>>>>>>>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture
>>>>> other
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> than
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Digidesign that want's to producer a DSP based DAW?? It's almost
>>>>> 6 years
>>>>>>>>>> since the plug was pulled on Paris! Yes, I did not forget about
>>>>>>>>>> Soundscape..

email me with the specifics.. take care..Lamont

"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:

>Lamont,

>

>Bingo - you just stated that Nuendo exhibits a wide and spacious (I would

>add clear) sound, where Paris is colored.

>That's what I want in a DAW - transparent/clear. I don't want colored.

>There are other ways to create color, but once it's in a colored mix engine,

>there is no way to take it back out. That's what I found with Paris -

>orchestral work and spacious synth pads never sounded right. Yes, it sounds

>great for rock, and many other styles, but in general I prefer a transparent

>starting point, creating attitude on a track by track basis as needed.

>I know that's a departure from the audio industry's engineering approach
to

>using consoles for their character almost as a mantra rather than

>understanding the real reason: we developed those expectations and

>"standards" if you will, because the formats weren't absolutely

>transparent - we had no choice - make the tool work for what it does, and

>find something else when the requirements change. However, I'm a purist,

>but without the unlimited budget to appease my ears. I always hated having

>to factor in any noise floor from analog consoles, or tape. We went to

a

>lot of trouble and expense trying to keep analog gear (which does have very

>good merits for character and color) sounding as clear as possible, and

now

>that we have clear digital (albeit not as clear as DSD or very high sample

>rates would), we spend the same amount of time trying to put it all back.

>Doesn't that sound just a little silly? I chalk it up to human nature.

But

>hearing a friend of mine in a well known audio engineering school talk,

you

>would think that these are standards that can't be changed without a

>unanimous UN resolution.

>

>I'll also be happy to take you up on your offer to Thad (if you will extend

>that offer to me) to send a DVD to mix in Nuendo. If you are serious, email
>me at: dedric at echomg dot com. You can include your best PTHD and/or
>Paris mixes of the same tracks - I'll see if I can match them, even if we
>don't have equivalent plugins.
>
>For the record, regardless of who you were addressing, I can hear the
>difference between a DCS converter, Mytek and Cransesong,
>and can hear the differences at very minute levels - including between Paris
>and other DAWs. But, your statement that it is a known fact that software
>"has a sound" is misleading, if not incorrect. Software does not have a
>sound beyond the accuracy of passing through what the converters interpret.
>What you are referring to are differences in how audio files are managed
in
>specific situations, and how accurate that is - the ongoing DAW debate is
>really about what is the "standard" or reference method. So far there isn't
>one that anyone can agree on: float vs. fixed, DSD vs. PCM, etc, etc. For
>example:
>
>What Lynn Fuston's DAWSUM sampler shows is that actual summing of 24-bit
>audio files (the act of adding at a given level) is identical in most DAWs
>that have a known, invariant, direct path. This doesn't mean 32-bit float
>and 48-bit fixed are identical in all mathematical uses, just that 22-24
>bits of dynamic range, added together, are. Any difference between DAWs in
>this test would indicate an error in pass through capability. The lowest
>levels are where the bit depth differences occur - with 24-bit files in
>unity gain summing, there will be nothing to use beyond a 24-bit dynamic range.
>At one time I found Paris was boosting gain exponentially as you go down.
|
>don't have Paris to confirm or recreate this (Sakis thinks we resolved that

>issue, but I don't ever recall doing so).

>

>**Also, interestingly, from Lynn's CD, Nuendo, Fairlight, Pyramix,
>Samplitude and PTHD mixes cancel completely through -144dB, although with

>very very small correlation differences between each (i.e. not one in
>particular - this could be a slight variance in phase alignment in the
>test), but Paris doesn't cancel with either - it exhibits differences as

>high as -82dB. I first thought the Paris mix sounded wider, but when
>comparing to Nuendo, and PTHD, the center of the mix sounded lower in
>volume, making the edges sound wider - with a very slight bit of phase
>oddity. The center of Nuendo sounded more defined, just as wide, just not

>as loud on the edges. Paris almost sucked the center very slightly to my

>ears, where Nuendo and PTHD pushed it a bit more. All of this can be
>subjective, and on different monitors, the results could vary.

>

>That's my take on it in more than a nutshell, and with more detail and
>comparative listening than forum talk.

>

>Regards,

>Dedric

>

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:43cd3715\$1@linux...

>>

>> Now, Thad,I'll be happy to ship/FTP you a project(50-24bit wav files)

on

>> /DVD for you to mix or just bring up with out mixing in SX. .Then, I want

>> you bring those same files into Paris, or PT HD/LE..Then, if you will,

>> report

>> your auditory findings...:)

>>

>> Dedric, I think you think that I'm saying that one app is superior to

>> another..Rather,

>> I'm saying "in different kinds of music genres, one app suites the music

>> more than others. Not, saying that you can't acheive great results from

>> any

>> DAW, but rather, some forms of music is easier to "MIX" in than others..

>> That's all I'm saying. FOr example. To me, I would not use Paris for

>> "critical

>> film scoring" work. To me, Nuendo/SX sound quality, with it's wide,

>> spacious,

>> audio quality is just the right audio foot print for the project.
>> Pro-Tools could be next and so could DP/Motus interfaces..But, the Paris
>> sound, would be too "colored" where you need the spearation, wide deep

>> sound
>> to hear evey element of a score. also, commerical work as well..
>>
>> But, Paris would and is atop of my DAW food chain for mixing ROCK,
>> HIP/HOP,
>> R&B, Gospel. Paris's Agressive crunch and it's colored sound when pushed
>> is alone in this dept followed by PT/with apogees Rosettas /AD/DA16x..
>> Again, this is my world real world findings, not some internet forum
>> talk..
>>
>> Sure, give me my MPC-2000& vs2480, and I'll get killer results everytime
>> that folks swear I used a DAW on.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Hey Dedic,
>>>
>>>Here's my take on this. I bought the DAW CD from Lynn What's His Name.
I
>>>listened to it. I took the tests. I took them again. I had someone jumble
>>>the tracks around and play them for me again. There were tiny wisp of

>>>smoke
>>>differences between the "best" and the "worst." On top of that, in an
ABY
>>>test I can't imagine anyone doing dramatically better than a coin flip.
>> Maybe,
>>>just maybe, a handful could, but I doubt even that.
>>>
>>>So, for me, that put the "summing bus" issue to rest. Until someone can
>> give
>>>me proof, and by proof I mean ABY testing or real matmatcal analysis
or
>>>resulting audio files from different systems, I will believe that all

>>>properly
>>>written summing busses sound essentially the same. After that summing
bus
>>>CD came out suddenly the critiques of summing busses moved into other

>>>areas
>>>like certain frequencies (that apparently weren't on the tesing CD) and
>> higher
>>>track counts and acoustic instruments and so on. When someone gets me

>>>evidence
>>>I'll be interested again, but until then I'm happily over here using SX
>> and
>>>Live. So is DJ Krush and about a million other talented people who I am
>> happy
>>>to have as my company.

>>>
>>>TCB

>>>
>>>Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>I guess I'm outnumbered in the Nuendo sucks or not debate.

>>>>
>>>>Interesting example of when pro gear and reputation isn't all it's
>>>>cracked
>>>>up to be:

>>>>
>>>>I got a voiceover from a top post house in my area to use to create and
>>>>ad
>>>>for a client. I don't know what they use, but PT would be the obvious
>>>>guess.

>>>>
>>>>The voiceover was just 30 minutes of Q&A with an expert, logged for later
>>>>use - the raw files from the studio were preprocessed - heavily over
>>>>compressed with no apparent attempt to address heavy sibilance before
>>>>compressing the crap out of it. Their goal is probably to produce quick
>>>>and
>>>>low cost, so they have a "preset" chain for audio, and charge \$200/hr
for
>>>>it
>>>>- no customization, just track it, burn it and send you on your way.

>>>>Their
>>>>rates are high, but project costs are low - you do the math, it's the
>>>>Walmart approach to production.

>>>>
>>>>There was little I could do to remove the sibilance without audibly
>>>>degrading the mids balance, and reaching diminishing returns very
>>>>quickly,
>>>>but I did make it sound better. Every voice over I've worked on, and

>>>>heard
>>>>from them sounds the same - sibilant, even in my car, from CD or on-air.
>>>>

>>>>The moral of the story - a lot of people call themselves pro, have pro
>> gear,
>>>>and hold a lion's share of their market to back it up, but that doesn't
>>>mean
>>>>the product is any better for it.
>>>>
>>>>I would rather be good using less than perfect gear to create a superior
>>>>product than have the best, most recent and advanced gear money can buy
>>>>and
>>>>not know what the heck I'm doing. Gear lust and aspiring for sonic
>>>>nirvana
>>>>is all well and good, but I had to put a limit on it and make it work
>>>>for
>>>>me, rather than against me. Now I'm just trying to make a living
>>>>creating
>>>>a
>>>>great product with what I have rather than worrying about how spending
>>>>\$30,000 more would make my audio sound 1% wider, or the top end 2%
>>>>silkier
>>>>when the client is going to cram it down an FM band with 10:1 or higher
>>>>compression, or rip it to a 128k or lower mp3, cutting off every sonic
>>>>nicety I slaved over and invested thousands of \$\$ to get.
>>>>
>>>>I'm off. Later.
>>>>
>>>>Dedric
>>>>
>>>>On 1/16/06 12:10 AM, in article 43cb38ba\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>><yiruyfh@hgdgr.net>
>>>>wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> La Mont,
>>>>>
>>>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at

>>>>> around
>>>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix
>>>>> on
>>>>>a native
>>>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
>>>>>big
>>>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and
>>>>> fader/FX
>>>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
>>>>>then
>>>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here.
>> I'm

>>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
>>>in
>>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and >> EQ's.
>>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For >>>a while
>>>> I was paranoid about signal degradatation with this many AD/DA's. Now I
>>>don't
>>>> even think twice.
>>>>
>>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>>
>>>> [http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo ve/](http://www.mercysakes.com/paris/Doug%20Joyce/Faith%20In%20Lo%20ve/)
>>>>
>>>> It's about finished, maybe a little more LF and vocal rebalancing and >>>a little
>>>> de-essing that I'm going to add. There are 30 tracks-12 drum tracks, >> vocal
>>>> track, 15 acoustic instrument tracks and 3 x electric bass tracks.

>>>> They've
>>>> got external processors all over them....10 x AD/DA's with analog
>>>> processors
>>>> in cubase Sx and another 6 x AD/DA's in Paris, but I'm happy with the
>>>> mix.....and
>>>> what's most important, so is the client. It doesn't have that linearity
>>>and
>>>> accuracy that I hear in the new PTHD, but we were going after a retro
>>>feel
>>>> and I think we achieved it. I think the Paris mix engine has a lot
to
>>>do
>>>> with it all hanging together. It just doesn't sound at all the same
if
>>>I
>>>> sum it in SX. Much smaller sounding. this mix has had no *mastering*,
>>>though
>>>> NoLimit was kissing the Paris mix bus.
>>>>
>>>> Deej
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpo@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> hey Dedric, a friend of mine has upgrade to Sonar5 and we can hear
the

>>>>> difference
>>>>> form version 4. Version 4 sound was very balnd , vanillia if you will.
>>>>> version
>>>>> 5 mix summing sounds very wide, with more dept than version 4..So,

>>>>> they
>>>>> did
>>>>> soemthing.
>>>>>
>>>>> Note: That's what I think Nuendos/SX weak point. in theory,their 32bit
>>>>> floating
>>>>> point mixer/summing bus was to allow for more audio options up and

>>>>> down
>>>>> the
>>>>> audio bandwdith, but, things(mixes) start to fall apart at a certain
>>>>> point.
>>>>> 32bit float is great for plugins, limited for summming with high track
>>>>> counts.
>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
>>>>> mixer
>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased
>>>>> productivity
>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>>
>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m c.htm
>>>>>
>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm>
>>>>>
>>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>>
>>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right

>>>>> with
>>>>> a
>>>>> 64

>>>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in
the
>>>tool
>>>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
>>>but
>>>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit
>> (assuming
>>>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the
>>>>>> concept,
>>>>> but
>>>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype until proven sonically.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>> Dedic
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 1/15/06 10:45 PM, in article 43cb24d5\$1@linux, "Deej"
>>>>>> <hdfajkl@hjkal.buzzz> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> This would be my idea of an optimized productivity scenario if I
was
>>>>> using
>>>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with
>> a
>>>moose
>>>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or

>>>>>>> Lavry's
>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing
box,
>>>>>>> I
>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you

>> need
>>>>> what
>>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer

>>>>>>> buddies
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so
>> ago.
>>>>> They
>>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us
all
>>>>> is
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
>>>the
>>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer
>>>>>>> technology,
>>>>>> that
>>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
>>>agreed
>>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
>>>out
>>>>>> having
>>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've
>>>been
>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great
>>>>>>> working
>>>>>> system
>>>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU
sped
>>>>> game.
>>>>>>> I've lost decnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my
>>>>>>> systems
>>>>>> were
>>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu
and
>>>>> OS..
>>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
>>>OS9
>>>>>> that's
>>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win
>>>>>>> 98se..Stable

>>>>> stable
>>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual
>> 867s
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their

>>>>>>> faces
>>>>> due
>>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred
>> our
>>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with
>>>>>>> Nuendo/PT
>>>>> Radar
>>>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand
a
>>>solid
>>>>>>> working
>>>>>>> system, that you do not have to make execues to yourself and the
>> client..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Detric may have said it best when he stated that doing a dedicated
>>>dsp
>>>>> system
>>>>>>> manybe a daughting task\$\$ Or so they say.. Stuff coming out of

>>>>>>> China
>>>>> (Phonic
>>>>>>> firewire) mixers as well as microphones and other products are

>>>>>>> astounding
>>>>>>> deals. Just maybe the solution I'm after will come from China?
>>>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting
>> off
>>>>>> cheap.
>>>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not

>>>>>>>>> productive..2)
>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much

>>>>>>>>> less
>>>>>>>>> expensive though, if budget is limited. For example, on the low
>> end
>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> Mac Mini comes with Garage Band and you can do a lot with that
and
>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>> inexpensive Firewire or USB i/o box for a total cost of less than
>>>\$1000.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
>> need
>>>>>>>>> (what I need may not be what you need and that could be the root
>>>of
>>>>>>>> this
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> discussion).
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> There are DSP-based systems out there that come with their own
>>>>>>>>> mixer/burner/software in a table-top format without requiring
a
>>>>>>>>> computer. They cost as much or more as a native system with a
fast
>>>>>>>>> computer. If you want to get off of the computer upgrade cycle,
>> they're
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> available and they do what they do pretty well. But they aren't
>>>>>>>>> particularly upgradable and upgradability is a big draw for
>>>>>>>>> computer-based systems.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Computer-based systems that include separate DSP cards have some
>>>of
>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> advantages and upgrade costs of native systems and some of the
>>>>>>>>> disadvantages and limitations of dedicated, non-computer-based

>>>>>>>>> systems.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> PARIS illustrates the disadvantages very well.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I bought an Intel computer for PARIS and bought an OS upgrade

>>>>>>>> along
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> way. A few years later I bought a faster G4 computer for PARIS
and
>>>>> it
>>>>>>>> was a noticable improvement. I also bought an upgrade for the

>>>>>>>> PARIS
>>>>>>>> software which added useful new features and some unfinished,

>>>>>>>> broken
>>>>>>>> features. It was nice to be able to upgrade but it did cost money
>>>just
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> as a native system would have. I was limited to the PARIS hardware
>>>>>>>> running on OS9, and the developers dropped support.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> PARIS would never get faster better, it was what it was. For me,
>>>the
>>>>>>>> freeze point in development stopped just short of what I needed.
>>>Close,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> but forever short. So I sold it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Meanwhile CPUs had gotten much, much faster and having separate
>> DSP
>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the DAW had lost much of its advantage. I switched to a native

>>>>>>>> system
>>>>>>>> running on the same G4 computer I had purchased for PARIS, but

>>>>>>>> using
>>>>>>>> native software along with a new i/o box and a better operating
>> system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The transition did not cost a lot overall and the sale of PARIS
>> pretty
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> much covered it.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I did live on the bleeding edge for a while, though, with the

>>>>>>>> transition
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> to OSX and I had to try several Firewire interfaces to find a
>>>>>>>> solid
>>>>> system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> After a few years I upgraded to a new computer but kept the
>>>>>>>> software
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> i/o box I was already using. I sold the previous computer, so
the
>>>>>>>> upgrade cost was not high. I upgraded the native software and

>>>>>>>> computer
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> OS several times and the increase in capability was worth the

>>>>>>>> upgrade
>>>>>>>> costs, just as it would have been with a DSP based system.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If I had to buy from scratch today, I'd either pick up a Quad

>>>>>>>> PowerMac
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> or save a bunch of money and get a dual G5 PowerMac, add extra
RAM
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> HD, Digital Performer or Logic, a Firewire i/o box or two and
some
>>>>> third
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> party plugins. That system would probably last for the next ten
>> years.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Even if I added a 24 moving fader controller it would be well

>>>>>>>> under
>>>>>> 10K.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Again, what I do and what you do may be different so your mileage
>>> may
>>>>>>>> vary.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> My current 2.5GHZ dual G5 is fast enough that I don't feel the

>>>>>>>> need
>>>>>> to

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> upgrade it for audio production. It could go for the next decade
>>>with
>>>>>>>> slowing me down.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> However if I decide to upgrade it at some point for animation
or
>>>video
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> production, the audio side will come along for the ride at no

>>>>>>>> extra
>>>>> cost.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> At least with a DSP based sytem, you know what you have, and
the
>>>native
>>>>>>>> cpu
>>>>>>>>> is a secondary issue.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> With the speed of CPUs today, why tie yourself to a
>>>>>>>>> hardware-limited
>>>>> DSP
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> system. If the company you buy it from is in business in five

>>>>>>>>> years,
>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> cost to upgrade a system like that could be much higher than just
>>>buying
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> a newer, faster computer.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> And when you buy a newer, faster computer you are upgrading
>>>>>>>>>>> everything
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> that runs on it, all your plugins, virtual instruments, even other
>>>>>>>>>>>> software (graphics, animation, video editing, software
>>>>>>>>>>>> development,
>>>>>>>>>>>> whatever else you do), in one shot.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Plus, low latency, better i/o integration in a pro
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> enviornment..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> This is your best argument. But latency is not an issue in my

>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>> setup. My i/o box has direct monitoring. Even if I monitor through
>>>> Logic
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the latency is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my
DAW
>>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>>> If
>>>>> I
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I
can
>>>> get
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different
>>>>>>>> manufacturers
>>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle
>> part
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
>>>to
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutiois is that
>>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic
>>>>>>>> native
>>>>> users
>>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
>>>person
>>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
>>>they
>>>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers

>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
>>>goes
>>>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a

>>>>>>>>> ProTools
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable
>>>>>>>>> results.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo since it's inception (2000,),logic audio,
I can
>>>>> with
>>>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
>>>and
>>>>>> truth
>>>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot
to
>>>be
>>>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> A Quad PowerMac with extra RAM and HD, MOTU Digital Performer,
a
>>>MOTU
>>>>>>>>>> Firewire i/o box or two and some third party plugins...even a
24
>>>moving
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> fader controller and you're well under 10K.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> It all comes down to individual needs and preferences, so I'm
not
>>>really
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> saying you're wrong for what you're looking for. But for what
I'm
>>>>>>>>>>>> looking for, a native system is pretty compelling.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> OTOH, had PARIS MIDI support been better, had they hung around

>>>>>>>>>>>> long
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> enough to support OSX and AU plugins, I'd still be using PARIS.
>> Even
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> with the limitation of 44.1 or 48 sampling.

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKruz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Take care,
>>>>>>>>> Lamont
>>>>>>>>> take care
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I dunno. Why lock into developing a new DSP system when native
>>> CPUs
>>>>> are
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> so fast now (fast enough for tons of tracks/plugins) and just
>> getting
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> faster?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The folks on gearslutz will always be chasing ways to spend
more
>>>>> money
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> on their systems (no matter what systems they have, native or
>> DSP).
>>>>>>>>>>>> There's no real cure for that. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> It's true the Mac Intel transition will take time. It's not
a
>> five
>>>>>> year
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> wait, though. Over the next six months there will likely be

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> choices for audio production that run on both Intel and PPC,

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> probably
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> starting with Logic around March/April as a \$50 upgrade, so
they

