
Subject: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [Nei](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 02:56:07 GMT

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

Ready? Got diapers handy? OK, let's DO IT!!!

Below is a link to a sort of "mashup" I did between a song I recorded & mixed (that I think most of you have heard) and a typical heavily-compressed Mike Shipley-mixed/Ted Jensen-mastered tune. Now, ths is not a diss on Mike Shipley, who's got more platinum records on his wall than I'll ever have in 27 lifetimes, but it ****MIGHT**** just be a diss on Ted Jensen and others who master like he does... well, he's got more platinum than i'll ever have too, but nonetheless CHECK IT OUT! Here's the deal:

1.) The file for "Panophobia" is a mixdown exported/rendered direct from Cubase to hard disk; it was originally recorded at 24-bit 88.2k, and mixed down to 16-bit 44.1k. The 16/44 stereo file was then imported back into a new project in Cubase, as was the comparison song. No big deal - nothing weird or tricky about all that.

2.) The file for the comparison song "Godspeed" by Anberlin was imported directly into CubaseSX from CD, digitally imported right from the onboard CD drive. No samplerate/bitrate conversions were needed on either file as the new project was set up as a 16-bit/44.1k project.

3.) Both songs were on separate stereo tracks in SX set at "0" gain. The Master was also left at zero. NO effects, EQ, plugins, or anything like that were used on either the master or the individual tracks in the comparison project that contained the stereo song files... all I did was snip & move.

4.) I exported to a hi-rez (320kbps) mp3 file - this is PLENTY of resolution to be able to hear the differences. It's about a 2 1/2 minute long file, so it's not dragged out or anything like that.

Here's the link... listen to how the DiMakina tune is VERY competitive in volume to the fully-mastered major label release, yet it's clearer, innit? Make sure you listen to the whole thing, as there are a couple of SIGNIFICANT differences right around the 2-minute mark/slightly thereafter.

<http://saqqararecords.com/MiscAudio/VolumeWithClarityExample-Comparison.mp3>

Hear all the high-end distortoshit up there in the Jensen-Mastered piece? IOW, the stuff that's NOT there in mine? This is what I've been trying to avoid, while acheiving competitive volume levels, and I think I've landed on it now!

Comments welcome.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 04:39:36 GMT

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

Ok.. Neil, I think you hit your Sonic Nirvana. Very clear, but with in your face volume.

I still dig the Anberlin Mix. I like it's use of stero delays and verbs. As for the Mastering, the top end distortion, i think makes for the overall sound of the mix. It's not overly distorted, rather very smooth distorted which , to me makes the mix sound well. I like good distortion. A little dirt is good for a mix in that genre.

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

>

>Ready? Got diapers handy? OK, let's DO IT!!!

>

>Below is a link to a sort of "mashup" I did between a song I
>recorded & mixed (that I think most of you have heard) and a
>typical heavily-compressed Mike Shipley-mixed/Ted Jensen-
>mastered tune. Now, ths is not a diss on Mike Shipley, who's
>got more platinum records on his wall than I'll ever have in 27
>lifetimes, but it ****MIGHT**** just be a diss on Ted Jensen and
>others who master like he does... well, he's got more platinum
>than i'll ever have too, but nonetheless CHECK IT OUT! Here's
>the deal:

>

>1.) The file for "Panophobia" is a mixdown exported/rendered
>direct from Cubase to hard disk; it was originally recorded at
>24-bit 88.2k, and mixed down to 16-bit 44.1k. The 16/44 stereo
>file was then imported back into a new project in Cubase, as
>was the comparison song. No big deal - nothing weird or tricky
>about all that.

>

>2.) The file for the comparison song "Godspeed" by Anberlin was
>imported directly into CubaseSX from CD, digitally imported
>right from the onboard CD drive. No samplerate/bitrate
>conversions were needed on either file as the new project was

>set up as a 16-bit/44.1k project.
>
>3.) Both songs were on separate stereo tracks in SX set at "0"
>gain. The Master was also left at zero. NO effects, EQ,
>plugins, or anything like that were used on either the master
>or the individual tracks in the comparison project that
>contained the stereo song files... all I did was snip & move.
>
>4.) I exported to a hi-rez (320kbps) mp3 file - this is PLENTY
>of resolution to be able to hear the differences. It's about a
>2 1/2 minute long file, so it's not dragged out or anything
>like that.
>
>Here's the link... listen to how the DiMakina tune is VERY
>competitive in volume to the fully-mastered major label
>release, yet it's clearer, innit? Make sure you listen to the
>whole thing, as there are a couple of SIGNIFICANT differences
>right around the 2-minute mark/slightly thereafter.
>
> <http://saqqararecords.com/MiscAudio/VolumeWithClarityExample-Comparison.mp3>
>
>Hear all the high-end distortoshit up there in the Jensen-
>is what I've been trying to avoid, while acheiving competitive
>volume levels, and I think I've landed on it now!
>
>Comments welcome.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 05:35:22 GMT

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

"LaMont" <jdpro@funk.com> wrote:

>
>Ok.. Neil, I think you hit your Sonic Nirvana. Very clear, but with in your
>face volume.
>
>I still dig the Anberlin Mix. I like it's use of stero delays and verbs.
>As for the Mastering, the top end distorton, i think makes for the overall
>sound of the mix. It's not overly distorted, rather very smooth distorted
>which , to me makes the mix sound well. I like good distortion. A little
>dirt is good for a mix in that genre.

Hey I'm not dissing the mix, I really like that Anberlin mix,
too - it's great work & has got some cool stuff going on - all
I'm sayin' is that for my personal taste I don't like the

distortion in it. It's almost like if you were to plunk an exciter across a mix & just set it on "max" lol but it's not as smooth as an exciter either, ya know?

Anyway - my sonic nirvana - yeah, I may have found it. Super-competitive volume AND clarity too!

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 06:30:32 GMT

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

Inquiring minds wanna know... what's your typical track count and dB settings?

AA

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OI.com> wrote in message news:46dcee9a\$1@linux...

>

> "LaMont" <jdpro@funk.com> wrote:

>>

>>Ok.. Neil, I think you hit your Sonic Nirvana. Very clear, but with in

>>your

>>face volume.

>>

>>I still dig the Anberlin Mix. I like it's use of stero delays and verbs.

>>As for the Mastering, the top end distorton, i think makes for the overall

>>sound of the mix. It's not overly distorted, rather very smooth distorted

>>which , to me makes the mix sound well. I like good distortion. A little

>>dirt is good for a mix in that genre.

>

> Hey I'm not dissing the mix, I really like that Anberlin mix,

> too - it's great work & has got some cool stuff going on - all

> I'm sayin' is that for my personal taste I don't like the

> distortion in it. It's almost like if you were to plunk an

> exciter across a mix & just set it on "max" lol but it's

> not as smooth as an exciter either, ya know?

>

> Anyway - my sonic nirvana - yeah, I may have found it. Super-

> competitive volume AND clarity too!

>

> Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 11:36:09 GMT

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

hey Neil, how about emailing me your phone number please. I'd like to chat with you about your mixes.

j o h n AT k f o c u s DOT c o m

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 11:37:02 GMT

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

Oh, I thought Paris was releasing a new version. hehe soon

John

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 14:53:39 GMT

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

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>Inquiring minds wanna know... what's your typical track count

>and dB settings?

Track count on the DiMakina stuff was mid-20's to mid-30's, depending on the song. I don't recall specifically what it was on that particular song, but I can check & let you know if you want. I know it was something like:

Kick

Snare

Hat

Toms L

Toms R

OH L

OH R

Bass Avalon 737

Bass MP2NV/Distressor

Guitars = probably about 8 to 10 tracks altogether (various parts coming in & out, everything tracked in dual-mono, with some things doubled).

Vocals = 7 or 8 tracks, as I recall (same kinda thing - various parts coming in & out, two different singers using two different mic & preamp setups on each one, some parts doubled, yada, yada, yada).

So I guess that'd be 24 to maybe 28 tracks on that tune altogether.

Not sure I know what you mean by typical db settings...
do you mean on specific channels, or RMS/PRMS measurements on
the 2-buss, or...???

If you mean on the 2-buss, I was able to get this song up into
the mid-to-low-4's PRMS... like around -4.3 was the hottest
part, as I recall. Mostly it was in the -4.7 range, PRMS.
Again, I'd have to re-check it to be certain.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to defecate drawers!!!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 15:00:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>
>hey Neil, how about emailing me your phone number please. I'd like to
chat
>with you about your mixes.
>j o h n AT k f o c u s DOT c o m

Done.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!
Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 15:37:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil, Neil Neil Neil Neil NEIL. Didn't crap my shorts on this one - and... I
don't even wanna be rude. Joe Jones and Reginal Hall anyone? Bah dum dum
dum....

rock on,
-Carl

"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46dcc947\$1@linux...
>
> Ready? Got diapers handy? OK, let's DO IT!!!

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [IOOIU](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 15:50:37 GMT

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

"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:

>Neil, Neil Neil Neil Neil NEIL. Didn't crap my shorts on this one - and...

I
>don't even wanna be rude. Joe Jones and Reginal Hall anyone? Bah dum dum
>dum....

I'm not talking about the mixes in terms of whether you like 'em or not - I'm talking about the volume wars issue... IOW, finding a way to get that competitive volume WITHOUT the usual inherent distortion - you don't think this represents a major accomplishment? Geez, I do! :D

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 18:20:36 GMT

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

Nope. Sorry man - the 'volume wars' is an old old argument. I'm glad that you are excited about finding techniques that you like, but "OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!" <<< that is a bit much. There are some truly gifted engineers and musicians within this forum - and although I've certainly plugged some mixes I've been excited about here - I would NEVER even joke to these folks with a line like that.

respect,
-Carl

"Neil" <IOOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46dd7ecd\$1@linux...

>
> "Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >Neil, Neil Neil Neil Neil NEIL. Didn't crap my shorts on this one - and...
> I
> >don't even wanna be rude. Joe Jones and Reginal Hall anyone? Bah dum dum
> >dum....
>
> I'm not talking about the mixes in terms of whether you
> like 'em or not - I'm talking about the volume wars issue...
> IOW, finding a way to get that competitive volume WITHOUT the
> usual inherent distortion - you don't think this represents
> a major accomplishment? Geez, I do! :D
>

> Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 19:33:48 GMT

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

Hey Neil,

I think you are on to something. There is a gritchiness in the highs that your recording does not have.

How does the band like it?

DC

btw, there is a growth market available for the first young player to rediscover clean guitar tone...

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [neil\[1\]](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 19:33:57 GMT

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

"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:

>Nope. Sorry man - the 'volume wars' is an old old argument. I'm glad that

>you are excited about finding techniques that you like, but "OK Gang...

get

>ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!" <<< that is a bit much. There are some truly

>gifted engineers and musicians within this forum - and although I've

>certainly plugged some mixes I've been excited about here - I would NEVER

>even joke to these folks with a line like that.

Ahhh... once again, the reference was not to the mix, it was -

- oh, never mind, if you didn't get the first explanation,

you're not going to comprehend a 2nd or 3rd.

Please, continue to selectively filter all text in order to extract the wrong inference in any post you come across.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHUT THE HELL UP!!!

Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 20:15:22 GMT

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

No Neil - I get it, I think your mix isn't a good comparison.

"Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46ddb325\$1@linux...
>
> "Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >Nope. Sorry man - the 'volume wars' is an old old argument. I'm glad that
> >you are excited about finding techniques that you like, but "OK Gang...
> get
> >ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!" <<< that is a bit much. There are some
truely
> >gifted engineers and musicians within this forum - and although I've
> >certainly plugged some mixes I've been excited about here - I would NEVER
> >even joke to these folks with a line like that.
>
> Ahhh... once again, the reference was not to the mix, it was -
> - oh, never mind, if you didn't get the first explanation,
> you're not going to comprehend a 2nd or 3rd.
>
> Please, continue to selectively filter all text in order to
> extract the wrong inference in any post you come across.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to become the only guy on this NG that doesn't
get it

Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 20:35:39 GMT

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

"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:

>No Neil - I get it, I think your mix isn't a good comparison.

Umm, let's see - they're both mixes, one's been mastered by one
of the preeminent hi-volume mastering dudes, the other is just
a final mix that hasn't been mastered, the final - yet
unmastered - mix is just as loud, if not louder, AND it's
cleaner.

How is that not a good comparison? Sorry I didn't think of
asking the label to release me all the raw tracks from that
song so that I could do my own mix of it in order to convince
you.

Other people here seem to get it. I don't think you do.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... so you aren't very polite either
Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 20:53:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil, your mix doesn't come close to the depth, thickness or balance of the other one. It's apples and oranges. I do think it's great that you found something you're diggin on though.

again - respect,
-Carl

"Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46ddc19b\$1@linux...

>
> "Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >No Neil - I get it, I think your mix isn't a good comparison.
>
> Umm, let's see - they're both mixes, one's been mastered by one
> of the preeminent hi-volume mastering dudes, the other is just
> a final mix that hasn't been mastered, the final - yet
> unmastered - mix is just as loud, if not louder, AND it's
> cleaner.
>
> How is that not a good comparison? Sorry I didn't think of
> asking the label to release me all the raw tracks from that
> song so that I could do my own mix of it in order to convince
> you.
>
> Other people here seem to get it. I don't think you do.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!
Posted by [Nil](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 22:18:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spammersontheair.com> wrote:
>
>Hey Neil,
>
>I think you are on to something. There is a gritchiness in the
>highs that your recording does not have.
>
>How does the band like it?

They liked the first version before the RMS/PRMS boost just

fine, but they like this one even better (of course, why wouldn't they - it's LOUDER! lol).

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2007 23:47:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Both actually.. what do your tracks typically sit at, what level do you track at and what's the buss sitting at during a mix. Wait, that's 3 innit :)

AA

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46dd7173\$1@linux...

>

> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>>Inquiring minds wanna know... what's your typical track count

>>and dB settings?

>

> Track count on the DiMakina stuff was mid-20's to mid-30's,

> depending on the song. I don't recall specifically what it was

> on that particular song, but I can check & let you know if you

> want. I know it was something like:

>

> Kick

> Snare

> Hat

> Toms L

> Toms R

> OH L

> OH R

> Bass Avalon 737

> Bass MP2NV/Distressor

> Guitars = probably about 8 to 10 tracks altogether (various

> parts coming in & out, everything tracked in dual-mono, with

> some things doubled).

> Vocals = 7 or 8 tracks, as I recall (same kinda thing - various

> parts coming in & out, two different singers using two

> different mic & preamp setups on each one, some parts doubled,

> yada, yada, yada).

>

> So I guess that'd be 24 to maybe 28 tracks on that tune

> altogether.

>

> Not sure I know what you mean by typical db settings...

> do you mean on specific channels, or RMS/PRMS measurements on
> the 2-buss, or...???

>
> If you mean on the 2-buss, I was able to get this song up into
> the mid-to-low-4's PRMS... like around -4.3 was the hottest
> part, as I recall. Mostly it was in the -4.7 range, PRMS.
> Again, I'd have to re-check it to be certain.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [Nil](#) on Wed, 05 Sep 2007 00:13:54 GMT

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

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>Both actually.. what do your tracks typically sit at,

My default project template has all the channel faders set at -6db, I find that's a good starting point. When I add channels for OD's & whatnot, I also start them out at -6. Obviously by that point the rest of channels are all over the place, as I kind of work the mix as I go along.

>what level do you track at

Somewhat hot - I mean I try to use every possible bit, but I also don't care all that much if a track's waveform ends up peaking at -2 as opposed to right at zero. Also, I don't normalize tracks if they're not peaking right at zero - that's just another step of processing that I don't think benefits anything & just adds another type of conversion to the process.

>and what's the buss sitting at during a mix. Wait, that's 3 innit

Yes, you only said two, so no answer for that third one lol
Actually, I leave the Master at zero and set Ozone (and now Elephant, too) both to -0.3.

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Wed, 05 Sep 2007 00:18:41 GMT

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

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

>They liked the first version before the RMS/PRMS boost just
>fine, but they like this one even better (of course, why
>wouldn't they - it's LOUDER! lol).

Good, now get a check!

heh

DC

Subject: Re: OK Gang... so you aren't very polite either
Posted by [Neil](#) on Wed, 05 Sep 2007 00:47:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:
>Neil, your mix doesn't come close to the depth, thickness or balance of
the
>other one. It's apples and oranges. I do think it's great that you found
>something you're diggin on though.

OK, one more time... look, I am NOT comparing mixes in the sense of saying: "ooh, my mix is better than that one"; I like that other mix a lot - fact is, though, it's got that typical modern rock, overcompressed mastered-in dirt in the quest of loudness. The ONLY comparison I was making between the two - and it IS a fair comparison, because it's a straight a/b "which sounds louder" comparison - is that mine is equally loud, if not louder in similarly-structured sections, and furthermore it's loud WITHOUT the dirt/grit/distortocrap.

Now, if you've found a way to achieve getting into the mid-4's PRMS range prior to this, all the while keeping it clean & clear, then goody on ya, but I - and I know the same goes for just about everyone on this NG, because we've had any number of discussions on this very topic - have not. So, that's the pants-shitting part... that I've found a way to do it and am telling everyone here what I used in case they want to try it.

Why do I even fucking bother with this sort of thing? Seems like every time I do, somebody comes along & crashes the party, saying this or that comparison was unfair for one imagined reason or another. Does anyone else feel the test was "unfair"? If so, just convert that mp3 file to a wav & import it into any application you have that you can insert whatever plugin you

use to measure RMS & PRMS. You'll see that the segments of the file that contain my mix will measure around the -4.3 to -4.7 range PRMS in the loudest places; that number can't be faked, manufactured, or otherwise manipulated - it is what it is.

Geez!

Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... so you aren't very polite either

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 05 Sep 2007 01:57:04 GMT

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

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46ddfca5\$1@linux...

>

> Why do I even fucking bother with this sort of thing? Seems
> like every time I do, somebody comes along & crashes the party,
> saying this or that comparison was unfair for one imagined
> reason or another. Does anyone else feel the test was "unfair"?

Unless you do the same thing summing the mix of both songs on an SSL with a Fairhampster 670 strapped across the mix buss and set to stun, then you've proven nothing.....haven't you learned this by now ?????

;oD

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHUT THE HELL UP!!!

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 06 Sep 2007 04:43:59 GMT

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

Nice to see that y'all can fight without me even being around.

Hate to think the place has gone soft....

DC

Hey Sarah, did you REALLY ask about nards??

"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:

>No Neil - I get it, I think your mix isn't a good comparison.

>

>

>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46ddb325\$1@linux...

>>
>> "Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:
>> >Nope. Sorry man - the 'volume wars' is an old old argument. I'm glad
that
>> >you are excited about finding techniques that you like, but "OK Gang...
>> get
>> >ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!" <<< that is a bit much. There are some
>truely
>> >gifted engineers and musicians within this forum - and although I've
>> >certainly plugged some mixes I've been excited about here - I would NEVER
>> >even joke to these folks with a line like that.
>>
>> Ahhh... once again, the reference was not to the mix, it was -
>> - oh, never mind, if you didn't get the first explanation,
>> you're not going to comprehend a 2nd or 3rd.
>>
>> Please, continue to selectively filter all text in order to
>> extract the wrong inference in any post you come across.
>>
>> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHUT THE HELL UP!!!
Posted by [rick](#) on Thu, 06 Sep 2007 08:52:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

well of course she did...she's a nurse.

On 6 Sep 2007 14:43:59 +1000, "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>
>Nice to see that y'all can fight without me even being around.
>
>Hate to think the place has gone soft....
>
>DC
>
>Hey Sarah, did you REALLY ask about nards??
>
>
>
>"Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>No Neil - I get it, I think your mix isn't a good comparison.
>>

>>
>>"Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46ddb325\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> "Carl Amburn" <carlamburn@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>> >Nope. Sorry man - the 'volume wars' is an old old argument. I'm glad
>that
>>> >you are excited about finding techniques that you like, but "OK Gang...
>>> get
>>> >ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!" <<< that is a bit much. There are some
>>truely
>>> >gifted engineers and musicians within this forum - and although I've
>>> >certainly plugged some mixes I've been excited about here - I would NEVER
>>> >even joke to these folks with a line like that.
>>>
>>> Ahhh... once again, the reference was not to the mix, it was -
>>> - oh, never mind, if you didn't get the first explanation,
>>> you're not going to comprehend a 2nd or 3rd.
>>>
>>> Please, continue to selectively filter all text in order to
>>> extract the wrong inference in any post you come across.
>>>
>>> Neil
>>
>>

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [Bart](#) on Thu, 06 Sep 2007 12:39:42 GMT

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

Hey Neil - just to tell you I would be very happy to get the results you got
!! and personally prefer yours to the pro master-
when you say you keep channel levels at -6 , your're talking about post
fader during mix down? as not to overload bus right ?
since switching from paris to sx , i have been frustrated with the tendancy
for the buss to get distorted at the slightest push .
again , just wanted to tell you i like the sound your getting-

-B

"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46ddd9b1\$1@linux...

>

> "DC" <dc@spammersontheair.com> wrote:

>>

>>Hey Neil,

>>

>>I think you are on to something. There is a gritchiness in the

>> highs that your recording does not have.

>>

>> How does the band like it?

>

> They liked the first version before the RMS/PRMS boost just

> fine, but they like this one even better (of course, why

> wouldn't they - it's LOUDER! lol).

>

> Neil

Subject: Re: OK Gang... get ready to SHIT YOUR PANTS!!!

Posted by [Neil](#) on Thu, 06 Sep 2007 13:23:55 GMT

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

"Bart" <wmn987@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Hey Neil - just to tell you I would be very happy to get the results you got

> !! and personally prefer yours to the pro master-

> when you say you keep channel levels at -6 , your're talking about post

> fader during mix down? as not to overload bus right ?

I'm talking about that's where I start the individual track channels out at, not to "keep" them there. Obviously, you gotta move 'em as you mix! And yes, part of the reason for that is to not start off with an overstuffed mix bus. The analogy I use is that if you're using an analog console, you wouldn't start off by pushing all your faders all the way up, would you? No - 'course not. So why would you start off all your DAW channels at zero, or what is essentially "all the way" up in the digital realm?

Paris being the exception, of course, since as we learned from Chuck awhile back, in Paris "zero" is really "minus 20".

Group channels for EFX & whatnot, and also the Master - those I leave at Zero.

> since switching from paris to sx , i have been frustrated with

> the tendency for the buss to get distorted at the slightest

> push .

Yeah you can't push it, that's for sure - it's not like Paris or like most analog consoles... you've got to get your glue elsewhere.

> again , just wanted to tell you i like the sound your getting-

Cool - thanks!

