Subject: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by LaMont on Wed, 18 Jan 2006 21:06:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php

Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range or non-existence
of this market segment, they anouce this.

Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi sequencers,
it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.

That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have a kill
new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)

If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I must admit
that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State of
New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..

I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So far,so good
:)
LaMont

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by jef knight[1] on Wed, 18 Jan 2006 21:25:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Apple only? fascists.
lol

LaMont wrote:

>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>
>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range or non-existence
>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>
>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi sequencers,
>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>
>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have a kill
>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>
>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I must admit
>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State of
>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>

>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So far,so good
>:)
>LaMont
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Wed, 18 Jan 2006 22:01:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are you
talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.

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

jef knight wrote:
> Apple only? fascists.
> lol
>
> LaMont wrote:
>
>> http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>> Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range or
>> non-existence
>> of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>
>> Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi
>> sequencers,
>> it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>> That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have a kill
>> new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>
>> If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I must
>> admit
>> that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State of
>> New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>
>> I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So far,so
>> good
>> :)
>> LaMont
>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by LaMont on Wed, 18 Jan 2006 23:25:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited about
Logic's audio recording performance.

The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes, the instruments
are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league of it's
own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in Cubase
SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app.

The audio engine is not as sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.

It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction. I only
hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then, Appple
will have a killer DAW.

Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
Take care.LAD

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are you

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

>>> non-existence
>>> of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>
>>> Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi
>>> sequencers,
>>> it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>> That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have a kill

>>> new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>
>>> If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I must

>>> admit
>>> that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State
of
>>> New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>
>>> I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So far,so

>>> good
>>> :)
>>> LaMont
>>>
>>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 01:43:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.

What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design? It seems reasonably CPU efficient already.

Do you have any complaints about the sound?

I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs attention, and Logic could require it less.

But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works now, many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where you need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to drag or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)

I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast. And Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.

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

LaMont wrote:
> Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited about
> Logic's audio recording performance.
>
> The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes, the instruments
> are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league of it's
> own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in Cubase
> SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app.
>
> The audio engine is not as sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
> sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>
> It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction. I only
> hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then, Appple
> will have a killer DAW.
>
> Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
> Take care.LAD
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are you
>
>
>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>jef knight wrote:
>>
>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>lol
>>>
>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range or
>
>
>>>>non-existence
>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>
>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi

>>>>sequencers,
>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have a kill
>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>
>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I must
>
>
>>>>admit
>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State
>
> of
>
>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>
>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So far,so
>
>
>>>>good
>>>>:)
>>>>LaMont
>>>>
>>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Bill Lorentzen on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 01:59:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some areas like
the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of time But
it has great synths!
Bill

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

> instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs
> attention, and Logic could require it less.
>
> But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works now,
> many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where you
> need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to drag
> or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>
> I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
> around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast. And
> Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> LaMont wrote:
>> Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited
>> about
>> Logic's audio recording performance.
>>
>> The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes, the
>> instruments
>> are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league of
>> it's
>> own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in
>> Cubase
>> SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is not as
>> sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>> sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>
>> It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction. I
>> only
>> hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,
>> Appple
>> will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>> Take care.LAD
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are you
>>
>>
>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>> -Jamie

>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>
>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>lol
>>>>
>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range or
>>
>>
>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>
>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi
>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have a
>>>>>kill
>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>
>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I must
>>
>>
>>>>>admit
>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>
>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So far,so
>>
>>
>>>>>good
>>>>>:)
>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by LaMont on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 06:21:19 GMT

Hi Bill,
You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD

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

>> waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual

>> bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>
>> What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
It
>> seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>
>> Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>
>> I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>> instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs

>> attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>
>> But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
now,
>> many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where you

>> need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to drag

>> or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>
>> I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions

>> around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
And
>> Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com

>>
>>
>> LaMont wrote:
>>> Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited

>>> about
>>> Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>
>>> The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes, the

>>> instruments
>>> are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
of
>>> it's
>>> own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in
>>> Cubase
>>> SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is not
as
>>> sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>> sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>
>>> It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction. I

>>> only
>>> hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,

>>> Appple
>>> will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>> Take care.LAD
>>>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are you
>>>
>>>
>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>lol
>>>>>
>>>>>LaMont wrote:

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range
or
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi

>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have a

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

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 06:55:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?

But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem with

the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.

As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.

7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.

The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio, but without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and 3rd party FX plugins and soft synths.

You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set of very useful tools right out of the box.

There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS. Get down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.

IOW not slow at all, IMO.

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

LaMont wrote:
> Hi Bill,
> You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>
> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>
>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some areas
>
> like
>
>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of time

>
> But
>
>>it has great synths!
>>Bill
>>
>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>
>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>
>
>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>
>
>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>
>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>
> It
>
>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>
>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>
>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs
>
>
>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>
>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>
> now,
>
>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where you
>
>
>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to drag
>
>
>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>
>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>
>
>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>
> And

>
>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>
>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited
>
>
>>>>about
>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>
>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes, the
>
>
>>>>instruments
>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>
> of
>
>>>>it's
>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in
>>>>Cubase
>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is not
>
> as
>
>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>
>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction. I
>
>
>>>>only
>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,
>
>
>>>>Appple
>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>
>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>

>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are you
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>
>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range
>
> or
>
>>>>
>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi
>
>
>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have a
>
>
>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I must
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State
>>>>
>>>>of
>>>>

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

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by jjdpro on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 09:25:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Jamie,

Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer. But,
I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools LE
AKA The Natives.

Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the way
these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix fairly
well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek, fast
as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange setup
that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5) and
with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.

Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice behind
their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot of users
who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You would
not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic) burn
rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today most
of htose users now run PT on their G5's.

If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested upgrade
users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus make
Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of it
being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.

The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic changes,
as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user

some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.

At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that Apple is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's layout and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the future of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not spening another dime on any apple product.

Take care..LaMont

Other users have voice thee same concerns

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>
>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem with

>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest

>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested

>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>
>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle

>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could

>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they

>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>
>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>
>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio, but

>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and 3rd

>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>
>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set of

>very useful tools right out of the box.
>
>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS. Get

>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>
>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>LaMont wrote:
>> Hi Bill,
>> You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>
>> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>
>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some areas
>>
>> like
>>
>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of time
>>
>> But
>>
>>>it has great synths!
>>>Bill
>>>
>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>
>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>>
>>
>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>>
>>
>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>
>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>>
>> It
>>

>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>
>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>
>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking

>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs
>>
>>
>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>
>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>>
>> now,
>>
>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where you
>>
>>
>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to drag
>>
>>
>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>
>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>
>>
>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>
>> And
>>
>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited
>>
>>
>>>>>about
>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>
>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes, the
>>
>>

>>>>>instruments
>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>>it's
>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in

>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is not
>>
>> as
>>
>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>
>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
I
>>
>>
>>>>>only
>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,
>>
>>
>>>>>Appple
>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>
>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are
you
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range
>>
>> or
>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi
>>
>>
>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have
a
>>
>>
>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I
must
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State
>>>>>
>>>>>of
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So far,so
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 09:46:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

LaMont wrote:
> Jamie,
>
> Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer. But,
> I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools LE
> AKA The Natives.

OK. I'm comparing Logic to PARIS and DP. I wasn't really impressed with SX or PTLE although it's been a while since I've looked at them, they have no doubt advanced since then. I have heard good things about Nuendo.

I'm not comparing Logic 5, it's been a long time since that was a current product and Logic has changed quite a bit since then. So if you're talking Logic 5 on OS9 or MSWindows that's ancient history. Logic has changed significantly since then.

PARIS is not native but we're all familiar with it here so we may as well use it as a reference point. Logic surpasses PARIS in overall capability (because, for one thing, Logic is continually developed while PARIS has stopped development) and Logic is at least as fast as PARIS to edit with. Plus, Logic can handle multiple takes on any track without going into a special mode on all tracks.

I had DP briefly. Logic was faster. This was on the G4 though, and a few revs back, so I can't say if that's still true.

> Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the way
> these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix fairly
> well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek, fast
> as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange setup
> that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5) and
> with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.

I'm hearing that you have some problems with the GUI, but I don't follow how that has to do with the underlying audio engine. You still haven't said clearly that you're complaining about the actual sound, so I guess you're not.

We agree that the environment window needs work.

In 7.1 (or maybe 6?) they added a fader/input strip for the current channel in the arrange window, so you can work in one window while tracking. I think the lack of that was a complaint for a while but it's there now.

Since I have an HD-capable monitor I have room for three mixer windows (audio tracks, output and MIDI tracks), plus the transport and arrange windows. So I don't need to work in a single window. Before that I used two monitors (much like PARIS) so again, it wasn't a big deal. Of course there are window sets tied to the number keys so even if you have a single monitor, if you want to use more than one window it's easy to jump to different window layouts as needed, and fast.

> Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice behind
> their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot of users
> who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You would
> not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
> Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic) burn
> rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
> of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today most
> of htose users now run PT on their G5's.

From my experience, while faster processors are always welcome the dual G5 is plenty fast for Logic. And Logic seems reasonably efficient.

How many tracks are they trying to run? I haven't hit the limit even on my most overproduced excercises in excess (nothing exceeds like excess! :^)

Even when I pile on loads of FX and instrument plugins, this thing carries the load. If I had a problem I could freeze tracks, used to have to do that on the G4.

The only reason I freeze on the G5 is due to a long-standing Logic bug where it will sometimes, randomly, forget to play back a soft synth. So if I'm working with a client I'll freeze finished tracks so I don't have to restart the project (that's the workaround).

See, I'm not saying Logic is perfect. But I'm interested to see what the actual audio complaint is because I'm not seeing a problem with audio performance on my system.

> If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested upgrade
> users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus make
> Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of it
> being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.

I'm still not sure what the audio problem is. Are you saying it should handle more tracks than it does?

If you know of other threads that make it clear I'd welcome a URL.

> The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic changes,
> as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
> I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
> some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.

Other than some GUI streamlining here and there (keeping in mind that a
lot of Logic is already very fast to use, IMO), what exactly do you want
to see changed? I'm not quite following you.

It seems to me that Apple/Emagic _have_ been changing the GUI in the
most recent releases. Case in point, dragging to copy or move FX in the
mixer, added in 7. Another example, the graphic view of EQ at the top of
each mixer strip, very PARIS-like, added in 6, I think. So it's not true
to imply that GUI changes are not being made or that Logic is stagnating.

But maybe there's some specific editing technique you'd like to see that
Logic doesn't support. Can you explain that further?

> At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that Apple
> is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's layout
> and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the future
> of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not spening
> another dime on any apple product.

I wouldn't spend any money on something I don't like either. But I do
appreciate the changes that came in Logic 6 and 7.1 and expect that to
continue.

The announced integration with the new Apogee stuff is a good sign (hey,
now we're on topic! ;^)

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

> Take care..LaMont
>
> Other users have voice thee same concerns
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>

>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem with
>
>
>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>
>
>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>
>
>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>
>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle
>
>
>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could
>
>
>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they
>
>
>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>
>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>
>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio, but
>
>
>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and 3rd
>
>
>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>
>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set of
>
>
>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>
>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS. Get
>
>

>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>
>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>LaMont wrote:
>>
>>>Hi Bill,
>>>You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>
>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some areas
>>>
>>>like
>>>
>>>
>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of time
>>>
>>>But
>>>
>>>
>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>Bill
>>>>
>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>>>
>>>
>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>>>
>>>
>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>
>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>>>
>>>It
>>>
>>>
>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.

>>>>>
>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>
>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>
>
>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs
>>>
>>>
>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>
>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>>>
>>>now,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where you
>>>
>>>
>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to drag
>>>
>>>
>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>
>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>>
>>>
>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>>
>>>And
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>about
>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>

>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes, the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in
>
>
>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is not
>>>
>>>as
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>
> I
>
>>>
>>>>>>only
>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are
>
> you
>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>-Jamie

>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range
>>>
>>>or
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have
>
> a
>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I
>
> must
>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State
>>>>>>
>>>>>>of
>>>>>>
>>>>>>

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

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by excelav on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 12:29:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

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

As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac is different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi media work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for multi media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite factor in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one processor is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time will tell on all this.

I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do, and your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.

James

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

>Jamie,
>
>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
But,
>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools LE
>AKA The Natives.
>
>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the way
>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix fairly
>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek, fast
>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange setup
>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5) and
>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>
>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice behind
>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot of
users
>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You would
>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
burn
>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
most
>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>
>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested upgrade
>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus make
>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of it
>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>
>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic changes,
>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.

>
>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that Apple
>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's layout
>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the future
>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not spening
>another dime on any apple product.
>
>Take care..LaMont
>
>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>
>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

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

>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>
>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>
>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio, but
>
>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and 3rd
>
>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>
>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set of
>
>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>
>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed

>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS. Get
>
>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>
>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.

>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>LaMont wrote:
>>> Hi Bill,
>>> You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>
>>> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>
>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some areas
>>>
>>> like
>>>
>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of time
>>>
>>> But
>>>
>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>Bill
>>>>
>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>>>
>>>
>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>>>
>>>
>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>
>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>>>
>>> It
>>>
>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>
>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>
>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>
>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs
>>>
>>>
>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>

>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>>>
>>> now,
>>>
>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where
you
>>>
>>>
>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to
drag
>>>
>>>
>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>
>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>>
>>>
>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>>
>>> And
>>>
>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>about
>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes,
the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>>
>>> of
>>>
>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in
>

>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is not
>>>
>>> as
>>>
>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>I
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>only
>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are
>you
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range
>>>
>>> or

>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have
>a
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I
>must
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the
"State
>>>>>>
>>>>>>of
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So
far,so
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by LaMont on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 17:18:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi James..

You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".

I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec
wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the velocity
engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
do"..

So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year
pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came
out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..

OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer.
The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Becuase
that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics
cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the
others that will be announce at this years Namm..

My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
LaMont

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest news.
> Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
> You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the new
>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual processor
>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the tests
>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors! In
>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
in
>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>
>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac

is
>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi media
>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for multi
>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite factor
>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one processor
>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
will
>tell on all this.
>
>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do, and
>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>
>James
>
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>
>>Jamie,
>>
>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>But,
>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools LE
>>AKA The Natives.
>>
>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the way
>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix fairly
>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek, fast
>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange setup
>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5) and
>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>
>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice behind
>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot of
>users
>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You would
>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>burn
>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>most
>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>
>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested upgrade
>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus make
>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of

it
>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>
>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
changes,
>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>
>>
>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
Apple
>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
layout
>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
future
>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not
spening
>>another dime on any apple product.
>>
>>Take care..LaMont
>>
>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>
>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>
>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem with
>>
>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>
>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>
>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>
>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle
>>
>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could
>>
>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they
>>
>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>
>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.

>>>
>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>
>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio, but
>>
>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and 3rd
>>
>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>
>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set
of
>>
>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>
>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>
>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS. Get
>>
>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>
>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>> Hi Bill,
>>>> You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>
>>>> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some areas
>>>>
>>>> like
>>>>
>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of
time
>>>>
>>>> But
>>>>
>>>>>it has great synths!

>>>>>Bill
>>>>>
>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>>
>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>>>>
>>>> It
>>>>
>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>
>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>>>>
>>>> now,
>>>>
>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where
>you
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to
>drag
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>>>
>>>> And
>>>>

>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes,
>the
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>>>
>>>> of
>>>>
>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in
>>
>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is not
>>>>
>>>> as
>>>>
>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>I
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

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

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the
>"State
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So
>far,so
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by TCB on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 17:38:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The Altivec processers are disturbingly, amazingly powerful. And they sit
there doing nothing because coding for them is extremely difficult and the
devlopment tools to take advantage of them never got anywhere close to good
enough. Which is a damn shame, think of all of those sad little floating
point calculations that were never vectorized. I weep for them, those sad
little calculations so ill treated by the generic floating point units on
the PPC chips. The never had a chance! sob sob . . .

TCB

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>Hi James..
>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>
>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec

>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
velocity
>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
>do"..
>
>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year
>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came
>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>
>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer.
>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Becuase
>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics
>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the
>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>
>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
>LaMont
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest news.
>> Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>> You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the new
>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual processor
>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the tests
>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
In
>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>in
>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>
>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>is
>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi media
>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for multi
>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite factor

>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
processor
>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>will
>>tell on all this.
>>
>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
and
>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>
>>James
>>
>>
>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>Jamie,
>>>
>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>But,
>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
LE
>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>
>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
way
>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
fairly
>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
fast
>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange setup
>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
and
>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.

>>>
>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice behind
>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot of
>>users
>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
would
>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>burn
>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>most
>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.

>>>
>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested upgrade
>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
make
>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of
>it
>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>
>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>changes,
>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>>
>>>
>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>Apple
>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>layout
>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
>future
>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not
>spening
>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>
>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>
>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>
>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>
>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem with
>>>
>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>
>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>
>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>
>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle
>>>
>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well

>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could
>>>

>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they
>>>
>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>
>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>
>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>
>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio, but
>>>
>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and 3rd
>>>
>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>
>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set
>of
>>>
>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>
>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>>
>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
Get
>>>
>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>
>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>> Hi Bill,
>>>>> You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>
>>>>> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some areas
>>>>>
>>>>> like

>>>>>
>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of
>time
>>>>>
>>>>> But
>>>>>
>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>>>>>
>>>>> It
>>>>>
>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>
>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>>>>>
>>>>> now,
>>>>>
>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where
>>you
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to
>>drag
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>>>>
>>>>> And
>>>>>
>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes,
>>the
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>>>>
>>>>> of
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
in
>>>
>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is
not
>>>>>
>>>>> as
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>I
>>>>>
>>>>>

>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
are
>>>you
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
range
>>>>>
>>>>> or
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best
>midi
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,

>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have
>>>a
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And,
>I
>>>must
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the
>>"State
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So
>>far,so
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by LaMont on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 19:13:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thad,
You're good :) (LOL)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>
>The Altivec processers are disturbingly, amazingly powerful. And they sit
>there doing nothing because coding for them is extremely difficult and the
>devlopment tools to take advantage of them never got anywhere close to good

>enough. Which is a damn shame, think of all of those sad little floating
>point calculations that were never vectorized. I weep for them, those sad
>little calculations so ill treated by the generic floating point units on
>the PPC chips. The never had a chance! sob sob . . .
>
>TCB
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Hi James..
>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>
>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec
>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
>velocity
>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
>>do"..
>>
>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year
>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came
>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>
>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer.
>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Becuase
>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics
>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the
>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>
>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
>>LaMont
>>
>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
news.
>>> Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.

>>> You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
new
>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual processor
>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the tests
>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!

>In
>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>in
>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>
>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>is
>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
media
>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for multi
>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
factor
>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
>processor
>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>>will
>>>tell on all this.
>>>
>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
>and
>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>
>>>James
>>>
>>>
>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Jamie,
>>>>
>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>But,
>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>LE
>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>
>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>way

>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>fairly
>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>fast
>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
setup
>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>and
>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>
>>>>
>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
behind
>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot
of
>>>users
>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>would
>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>burn
>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>most
>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>
>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
upgrade
>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>make
>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of
>>it
>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>
>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>changes,
>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>>>
>>>>
>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>Apple
>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>layout
>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
>>future
>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not

>>spening
>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>
>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>
>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>
>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>
>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
with
>>>>
>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>>
>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>
>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>
>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle
>>>>
>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>
>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could
>>>>
>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they
>>>>
>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>>
>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>
>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>>
>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
but
>>>>
>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and
3rd
>>>>
>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>
>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set

>>of
>>>>
>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>
>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>>>
>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
>Get
>>>>
>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a

>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>
>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>> Hi Bill,
>>>>>> You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
areas
>>>>>>
>>>>>> like
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of
>>time
>>>>>>
>>>>>> But
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>>>>>>
>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>>
>>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window
needs
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>>>>>>
>>>>>> now,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where
>>>you
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
to
>>>drag
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> And
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been
excited
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes,
>>>the
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>>>>>
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
>in
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is
>not
>>>>>>
>>>>>> as
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>I
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
Then,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
>are

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

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the
>>>"State
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes..
So
>>>far,so
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 21:46:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I would think anyone who has used Logic 7.1 on a dual G5, (and who has used the current version of Logic enough to know and take advantage of its clever shortcuts and design strengths to get around its remaining shortcomings), could easily see that the system more than reasonably fast.

Altivec, whatever, the system is amazing. I won't say perfect. But amazing, absolutely.

I think I hear echos of obsolete info from the Logic 5, OS9, Wi95 days, or learning curve problems. It does take a few weeks to get on top of Logic and to know how to drive it for speed. For that reason and for the soft synth forgetfullness bug I don't always recommend Logic to newbies. But for anyone who wants incredible performance and features for the $$ and is willing to spend some time learning it, I recommend checking it out.

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

James McCloskey wrote:
> Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of Altivec, and
> some plugin manufactures use it. Altivec was not necessary for Paris because
> it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
> believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple, or a
> test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if anybody
> else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>
> Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in the
> way of their opinions!!!!!
>
> Some use of Altivec.
>
> Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having Altivec.
> http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html
>
> Steinberg 2002
> http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR /Cubase-VST-51.html
>
> http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec
>
> Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move to dual
> processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture, it may
> all be a moot point.
>
> http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>
> James
>
>
> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>Hi James..
>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>
>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec
>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
>
> velocity
>
>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
>>do"..

>>
>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year
>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came
>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>
>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer.
>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Becuase
>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics
>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the
>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>
>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
>>LaMont
>>
>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest news.
>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the new
>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual processor
>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the tests
>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>
> In
>
>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>
>>in
>>
>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>
>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>
>>is
>>
>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi media
>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for multi

>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite factor
>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
>
> processor
>
>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>>
>>will
>>
>>>tell on all this.
>>>
>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
>
> and
>
>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>
>>>James
>>>
>>>
>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>Jamie,
>>>>
>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>
>>>But,
>>>
>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>
> LE
>
>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>
>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>
> way
>
>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>
> fairly
>
>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>
> fast
>

>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange setup
>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>
> and
>
>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>
>
>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice behind
>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot of
>>>
>>>users
>>>
>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>
> would
>
>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>
>>>burn
>>>
>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>
>>>most
>>>
>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>
>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested upgrade
>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>
> make
>
>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of
>>
>>it
>>
>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>
>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>
>>changes,
>>
>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>>>

>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>
>>Apple
>>
>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>
>>layout
>>
>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
>>
>>future
>>
>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not
>>
>>spening
>>
>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>
>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>
>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>
>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>
>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem with
>>>>
>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>>
>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>
>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>
>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle
>>>>
>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>
>
>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could
>>>>
>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they
>>>>
>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>>
>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.

>>>>>
>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>>
>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio, but
>>>>
>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and 3rd
>>>>
>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>
>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set
>>
>>of
>>
>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>
>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>>>
>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
>
> Get
>
>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>
>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hi Bill,
>>>>>>You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some areas
>>>>>>
>>>>>>like
>>>>>>
>>>>>>

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

>>>
>>>drag
>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>And
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes,
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>>>>>
>>>>>>of
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
>
> in
>
>>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is

>
> not
>
>>>>>>as
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>
>>>>I
>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
>
> are
>
>>>>you
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:

>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>
> range
>
>>>>>>or
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best
>>
>>midi
>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have
>>>>
>>>>a
>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And,
>>
>>I
>>
>>>>must
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the
>>>
>>>"State
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So
>>>
>>>far,so
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Dedric Terry on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 22:05:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I used Logic on PC until moving to Nuendo. I never thought it was hard to
learn, but maybe I'm weird that way.
I agree with Lamont - it is probably the best sequencer out there. Audio,
not as nice as Nuendo, but certainly
workable. I still have a soft spot for Logic even though I don't use it
much.
Did I read right in this thread that it still doesn't have sample accurate
editing for audio?

As far as the new Macs go, I hope they are as fast as comparable PCs, and
priced competitively. Perhaps
then both companies would have level competition to force better operating
systems, hardware, apps, etc..
....okay, I'm dreaming now...

I can't see moving back to Logic just for the new Apogee hardware, but I
like the concept and claims of tight
integration with Logic. I guess Apple really is serious about pro audio
(either that or Apogee is hoping they are).

Regards,
Dedric

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43d0087b@linux...
>
> I would think anyone who has used Logic 7.1 on a dual G5, (and who has
> used the current version of Logic enough to know and take advantage of its
> clever shortcuts and design strengths to get around its remaining
> shortcomings), could easily see that the system more than reasonably fast.
>
> Altivec, whatever, the system is amazing. I won't say perfect. But

> amazing, absolutely.
>
> I think I hear echos of obsolete info from the Logic 5, OS9, Wi95 days, or
> learning curve problems. It does take a few weeks to get on top of Logic
> and to know how to drive it for speed. For that reason and for the soft
> synth forgetfullness bug I don't always recommend Logic to newbies. But
> for anyone who wants incredible performance and features for the $$ and is
> willing to spend some time learning it, I recommend checking it out.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> James McCloskey wrote:
>> Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of Altivec, and
>> some plugin manufactures use it. Altivec was not necessary for Paris
>> because
>> it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
>> believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple, or a
>> test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if
>> anybody
>> else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>>
>> Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in the
>> way of their opinions!!!!!
>>
>> Some use of Altivec.
>>
>> Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having
>> Altivec.
>> http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html
>>
>> Steinberg 2002
>> http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR /Cubase-VST-51.html
>>
>> http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec
>>
>> Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move to
>> dual
>> processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture, it
>> may
>> all be a moot point.
>>
>> http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>>
>> James
>>

>>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>>Hi James..
>>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>>
>>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe
>>>Altivec
>>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
>>
>> velocity
>>
>>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
>>>do"..
>>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to
>>>"fabricate"
>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a
>>>year
>>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were
>>>counting
>>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX
>>>came
>>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any
>>>longer.
>>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity
>>>engine..Becuase
>>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most
>>>graphics
>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the
>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>
>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain
>>>significant
>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the
>>>CPU..??
>>>LaMont
>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>

>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>>news.
>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the new
>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
>>>>processor
>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the
>>>>tests
>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and
>>>>integer,
>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>>
>> In
>>
>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>
>>>in
>>>
>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the
>>>>performance
>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>>
>>>is
>>>
>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>>>>media
>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for
>>>>multi
>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole
>>>>equation
>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
>>>>factor
>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>>>>core
>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
>>
>> processor
>>
>>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>>>
>>>will
>>>
>>>>tell on all this.
>>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
>>
>> and

>>
>>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>>James
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Jamie,
>>>>>
>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>>
>>>>But,
>>>>
>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>>
>> LE
>>
>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>
>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>>
>> way
>>
>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>>
>> fairly
>>
>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>>
>> fast
>>
>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>>>>>setup
>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>>
>> and
>>
>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>
>>
>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
>>>>>behind
>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot of
>>>>
>>>>users
>>>>
>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>>

>> would
>>
>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and
>>>>>upgraded
>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>
>>>>burn
>>>>
>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain
>>>>>version
>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>>
>>>>most
>>>>
>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>>>>>upgrade
>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>>
>> make
>>
>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of
>>>
>>>it
>>>
>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>
>>>changes,
>>>
>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs. I'm not
>>>>>putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>>>>
>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>>
>>>Apple
>>>
>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>>
>>>layout
>>>
>>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
>>>
>>>future
>>>
>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not
>>>

>>>spening
>>>
>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>
>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>
>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>>>>>with
>>>>>
>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you
>>>>>>suggest
>>>>>
>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously
>>>>>>interested
>>>>>
>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a
>>>>>>handle
>>>>>
>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>>
>>
>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they
>>>>>>could
>>>>>
>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and
>>>>>>they
>>>>>
>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>>>
>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>>>>but
>>>>>
>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and

>>>>>>3rd
>>>>>
>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>>>>
>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
>>
>> Get
>>
>>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Hi Bill, You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual
>>>>>>>>instruments..LAD
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
>>>>>>>>>>areas
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>like
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of
>>>>>
>>>time
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>But
>>>>>>>>

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

>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving
>>>>>>>>>regions
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very
>>>>>>>>>fast.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>And
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been
>>>>>>>>>>excited
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes,
>>>>
>>>>the
>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in
>>>>>>>>>>league
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
>>
>> in
>>
>>>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is

>>
>> not
>>
>>>>>>>as
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right
>>>>>>>>>>direction.
>>>>>
>>>>>I
>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
>>>>>>>>>>Then,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are
>>>>>>>>>>steller..
>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
>>
>> are
>>
>>>>>you
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>lol

>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>>
>> range
>>
>>>>>>>or
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best
>>>
>>>midi
>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
>>>>>>>>>>>>>have
>>>>>
>>>>>a
>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And,
>>>
>>>I
>>>
>>>>>must
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the
>>>>
>>>>"State
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>

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

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 22:13:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric Terry wrote:
> I used Logic on PC until moving to Nuendo. I never thought it was hard to
> learn, but maybe I'm weird that way.
> I agree with Lamont - it is probably the best sequencer out there. Audio,
> not as nice as Nuendo, but certainly
> workable. I still have a soft spot for Logic even though I don't use it
> much.
> Did I read right in this thread that it still doesn't have sample accurate
> editing for audio?

Hey Dedric, yep you read it but it was wrong...Logic 7.1 does have
sample accurate editing.

I continue to hear good things about Nuendo. What audio features do you
think it has that Logic lacks?

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

>
> As far as the new Macs go, I hope they are as fast as comparable PCs, and
> priced competitively. Perhaps
> then both companies would have level competition to force better operating
> systems, hardware, apps, etc..
> ...okay, I'm dreaming now...
>

> I can't see moving back to Logic just for the new Apogee hardware, but I
> like the concept and claims of tight
> integration with Logic. I guess Apple really is serious about pro audio
> (either that or Apogee is hoping they are).
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43d0087b@linux...
>
>>I would think anyone who has used Logic 7.1 on a dual G5, (and who has
>>used the current version of Logic enough to know and take advantage of its
>>clever shortcuts and design strengths to get around its remaining
>>shortcomings), could easily see that the system more than reasonably fast.
>>
>>Altivec, whatever, the system is amazing. I won't say perfect. But
>>amazing, absolutely.
>>
>>I think I hear echos of obsolete info from the Logic 5, OS9, Wi95 days, or
>>learning curve problems. It does take a few weeks to get on top of Logic
>>and to know how to drive it for speed. For that reason and for the soft
>>synth forgetfullness bug I don't always recommend Logic to newbies. But
>>for anyone who wants incredible performance and features for the $$ and is
>>willing to spend some time learning it, I recommend checking it out.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>James McCloskey wrote:
>>
>>> Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of Altivec, and
>>>some plugin manufactures use it. Altivec was not necessary for Paris
>>>because
>>>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
>>>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple, or a
>>>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if
>>>anybody
>>>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>>>
>>>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in the
>>>way of their opinions!!!!!
>>>
>>>Some use of Altivec.
>>>
>>>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having
>>>Altivec.

>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html
>>>
>>>Steinberg 2002
>>> http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR /Cubase-VST-51.html
>>>
>>>http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec
>>>
>>>Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move to
>>>dual
>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture, it
>>>may
>>>all be a moot point.
>>>
>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>>>
>>>James
>>>
>>>
>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Hi James..
>>>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>>>
>>>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>>>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>>>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe
>>>>Altivec
>>>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
>>>
>>>velocity
>>>
>>>
>>>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
>>>>do"..
>>>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to
>>>>"fabricate"
>>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a
>>>>year
>>>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>>>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were
>>>>counting
>>>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX
>>>>came
>>>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang

>>>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>>>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any
>>>>longer.
>>>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>>>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity
>>>>engine..Becuase
>>>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most
>>>>graphics
>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the
>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>
>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain
>>>>significant
>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the
>>>>CPU..??
>>>>LaMont
>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>>>news.
>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the new
>>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
>>>>>processor
>>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the
>>>>>tests
>>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and
>>>>>integer,
>>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>>>
>>>In
>>>
>>>
>>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>>
>>>>in
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the
>>>>>performance
>>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>>>
>>>>is
>>>>

>>>>
>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>>>>>media
>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for
>>>>>multi
>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole
>>>>>equation
>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
>>>>>factor
>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>>>>>core
>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
>>>
>>>processor
>>>
>>>
>>>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>>>>
>>>>will
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>tell on all this.
>>>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>
>>>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>>>James
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Jamie,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>>>
>>>>>But,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>>>
>>>LE
>>>
>>>
>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>>

>>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>>>
>>>way
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>>>
>>>fairly
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>>>
>>>fast
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>>>>>>setup
>>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
>>>>>>behind
>>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot of
>>>>>
>>>>>users
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>>>
>>>would
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and
>>>>>>upgraded
>>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>>
>>>>>burn
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain
>>>>>>version
>>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>>>

>>>>>most
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>>>>>>upgrade
>>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>>>
>>>make
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of
>>>>
>>>>it
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>>
>>>>changes,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs. I'm not
>>>>>>putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>>>>>
>>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>>>
>>>>Apple
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>>>
>>>>layout
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
>>>>
>>>>future
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not
>>>>
>>>>spening
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>

>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>>>>>>with
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you
>>>>>>>suggest
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously
>>>>>>>interested
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a
>>>>>>>handle
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they
>>>>>>>could
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and
>>>>>>>they
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>>>>
>>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>>>>>but
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and
>>>>>>>3rd
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set
>>>>
>>>>of
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>>>>>
>>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
>>>
>>>Get
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>>>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hi Bill, You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual
>>>>>>>>instruments..LAD
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
>>>>>>>>>areas
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>like
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of
>>>>
>>>>time
>>>>

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

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

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

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

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

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by excelav on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 22:22:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of Altivec, and
some plugin manufactures use it. Altivec was not necessary for Paris because
it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple, or a
test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if anybody

else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!

Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in the
way of their opinions!!!!!

Some use of Altivec.

Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having Altivec.
http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html

Steinberg 2002
 http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR /Cubase-VST-51.html

http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec

Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move to dual
processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture, it may
all be a moot point.

http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html

James

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>Hi James..
>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>
>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec
>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
velocity
>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
>do"..
>
>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year
>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came
>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>

>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer.
>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Becuase
>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics
>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the
>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>
>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
>LaMont
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest news.
>> Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>> You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the new
>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual processor
>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the tests
>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
In
>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>in
>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>
>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>is
>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi media
>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for multi
>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite factor
>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
processor
>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>will
>>tell on all this.
>>
>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
and
>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>
>>James
>>
>>

>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>Jamie,
>>>
>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>But,
>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
LE
>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>
>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
way
>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
fairly
>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
fast
>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange setup
>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
and
>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.

>>>
>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice behind
>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot of
>>users
>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
would
>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>burn
>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>most
>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>
>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested upgrade
>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
make
>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of
>it
>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>
>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>changes,
>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>>

>>>
>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>Apple
>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>layout
>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
>future
>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not
>spening
>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>
>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>
>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>
>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>
>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem with
>>>
>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>
>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>
>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>
>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle
>>>
>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well

>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could
>>>
>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they
>>>
>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>
>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>
>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>
>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio, but
>>>
>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and 3rd
>>>

>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>
>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set
>of
>>>
>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>
>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>>
>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
Get
>>>
>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>
>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>> Hi Bill,
>>>>> You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>
>>>>> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some areas
>>>>>
>>>>> like
>>>>>
>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of
>time
>>>>>
>>>>> But
>>>>>
>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>>>>>>
>>>>>>

>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>>>>>
>>>>> It
>>>>>
>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>
>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>>>>>
>>>>> now,
>>>>>
>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where
>>you
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to
>>drag
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>>>>
>>>>> And
>>>>>
>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes,
>>the
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>>>>
>>>>> of
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
in
>>>
>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is
not
>>>>>
>>>>> as
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>I
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
are
>>>you

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

>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the
>>"State
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So
>>far,so
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 22:28:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

For anyone interested here's the wikopedia link:
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AltiVec

Poking around on the net, it looks like folks developing for AltiVec
include Red Hat and Yellowdog Linux.

On the Mac, Apple does, as you say. True, they ONLY make comprehensive
tools for writing, presenting, recording, editing, animating,
compositing, etc. So I agree it's a VERY limited universe of merely
everything you need to produce media content...

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

So it's probably not as dire as all that. I'll betcha Adobe uses the SSE
stuff on Intel/Athlon, so cross-platform development isn't out of the
question. SSE is there on the new Macs, BTW.

But forget all the AltiVec/SSE stuff, where OSX gets really cool is the
core image stuff for real time media stuff running on the GPU. Crazy.

Anyhoo,
-Jamie
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

TCB wrote:
> Pretty much the only apps that use Altivec are written by Apple (and run only
> on Macs) or are specially coded apps used written by research labs and such
> that write their own code. Anyone trying to support multiple platforms would
> be absolutely foolish to code for a (difficult to work with) vector unit
> only on one platform.
>
> TCB
>
> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>>Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of Altivec, and
>>some plugin manufactures use it. Altivec was not necessary for Paris because
>>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
>>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple, or a
>>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if anybody
>>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>>
>>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in the
>>way of their opinions!!!!!
>>
>>Some use of Altivec.
>>
>>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having Altivec.
>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html
>>
>>Steinberg 2002
>> http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR /Cubase-VST-51.html
>>
>>http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec
>>
>>Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move to
>
> dual
>
>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture, it
>
> may
>
>>all be a moot point.
>>
>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>>

>>James
>>
>>
>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>>Hi James..
>>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>>
>>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec
>>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
>>
>>velocity
>>
>>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
>>>do"..
>>>
>>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year
>>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came
>>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>>
>>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer.
>>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Becuase
>>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics
>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the
>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>
>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
>>>LaMont
>>>
>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>
> news.
>
>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.

>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
>
> new
>
>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual processor
>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the tests
>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>
>
>>In
>>
>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>
>>>in
>>>
>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>
>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>>
>>>is
>>>
>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>
> media
>
>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for multi
>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
>
> factor
>
>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
>>
>>processor
>>
>>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>>>
>>>will
>>>
>>>>tell on all this.
>>>>
>>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
>>
>>and

>>
>>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>>
>>>>James
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Jamie,
>>>>>
>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>>
>>>>But,
>>>>
>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>>
>>LE
>>
>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>
>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>>
>>way
>>
>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>>
>>fairly
>>
>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>>
>>fast
>>
>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>
> setup
>
>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>>
>>and
>>
>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>
>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
>
> behind
>
>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot
>

> of
>
>>>>users
>>>>
>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>>
>>would
>>
>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>
>>>>burn
>>>>
>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>>
>>>>most
>>>>
>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>>
>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>
> upgrade
>
>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>>
>>make
>>
>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of
>>>
>>>it
>>>
>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>
>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>
>>>changes,
>>>
>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>>>>
>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>>
>>>Apple
>>>
>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>>

>>>layout
>>>
>>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
>>>
>>>future
>>>
>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not
>>>
>>>spening
>>>
>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>
>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>
>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>
> with
>
>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>>>
>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>>
>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle
>>>>>
>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>>
>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could
>>>>>
>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they
>>>>>
>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>>>
>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>

> but
>
>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and
>
> 3rd
>
>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete set
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
>>>>
>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
>>
>>Get
>>
>>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or a
>
>
>>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Hi Bill,
>>>>>>>You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
>
> areas
>

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

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

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
>>
>>in
>>
>>>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is
>>
>>not
>>
>>>>>>>as
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>>
>>>>>I
>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
>
> Then,
>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
>>
>>are
>>
>>>>>you
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie

>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>>
>>range
>>
>>>>>>>or
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best
>>>
>>>midi
>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
>
> have
>
>>>>>a
>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And,
>>>
>>>I
>>>
>>>>>must

>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the
>>>>
>>>>"State
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes..
>
> So
>
>>>>far,so
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by TCB on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 22:49:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

James, you realize you're quoting me, right?

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of Altivec, and
>some plugin manufactures use it. Altivec was not necessary for Paris because
>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple, or a
>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if anybody
>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>
>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in the
>way of their opinions!!!!!
>
>Some use of Altivec.
>

>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having Altivec.
>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html
>
>Steinberg 2002
> http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR /Cubase-VST-51.html
>
>http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec
>
>Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move to
dual
>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture, it
may
>all be a moot point.
>
>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>
>James
>
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Hi James..
>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>
>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec
>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
>velocity
>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
>>do"..
>>
>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year
>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came
>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>
>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer.
>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Becuase
>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics

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

>In
>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>in
>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>
>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>is
>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
media
>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for multi
>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
factor
>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
>processor
>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>>will
>>>tell on all this.
>>>
>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
>and
>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>
>>>James
>>>
>>>

>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Jamie,
>>>>
>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>But,
>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>LE
>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>
>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>way
>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>fairly
>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>fast
>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
setup
>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>and
>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>
>>>>
>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
behind
>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot
of
>>>users
>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>would
>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>burn
>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>most
>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>
>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
upgrade
>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>make
>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of
>>it
>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>
>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>changes,

>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>>>
>>>>
>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>Apple
>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>layout
>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
>>future
>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not
>>spening
>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>
>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>
>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>
>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>
>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
with
>>>>>
>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>>>
>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>>
>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>
>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a handle
>>>>>
>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>
>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they could
>>>>>
>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and they
>>>>>
>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>>>>
>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>
>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>>

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

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

>>>>>>
>>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>>
>>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window
needs
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>>>>>>
>>>>>> now,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where
>>>you
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
to
>>>drag
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>>>>>
>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> And
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been
excited
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes,
>>>the
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>>>>>
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
>in
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is
>not
>>>>>>
>>>>>> as
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>I
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..

Then,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
>are
>>>>you
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>range
>>>>>>
>>>>>> or
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best
>>midi
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.

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

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by TCB on Thu, 19 Jan 2006 23:08:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Pretty much the only apps that use Altivec are written by Apple (and run only on Macs) or are specially coded apps used written by research labs and such that write their own code. Anyone trying to support multiple platforms would be absolutely foolish to code for a (difficult to work with) vector unit only on one platform.

TCB

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of Altivec, and
>some plugin manufactures use it. Altivec was not necessary for Paris because
>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple, or a
>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if anybody
>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>
>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in the
>way of their opinions!!!!!
>
>Some use of Altivec.
>
>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having Altivec.
>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html
>
>Steinberg 2002
> http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR /Cubase-VST-51.html
>
>http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec
>
>Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move to
dual
>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture, it
may
>all be a moot point.
>
>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>
>James
>
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Hi James..
>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>
>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec
>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
>velocity
>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to

>>do"..
>>
>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year
>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came
>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>
>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer.
>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Becuase
>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics
>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the
>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>
>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
>>LaMont
>>
>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
news.
>>> Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>>> You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
new
>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual processor
>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the tests
>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!

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

>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
factor
>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
>processor
>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>>will
>>>tell on all this.
>>>
>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
>and
>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>
>>>James
>>>
>>>
>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Jamie,
>>>>
>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>But,
>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>LE
>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>
>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>way
>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>fairly
>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>fast
>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
setup
>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>and
>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>
>>>>
>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
behind
>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot
of
>>>users
>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>would
>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and upgraded
>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)

>>>burn
>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain version
>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>most
>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>
>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
upgrade
>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>make
>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead of
>>it
>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>
>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>changes,
>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time user
>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to see.
>>>
>>>>
>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>Apple
>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>layout
>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing the
>>future
>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm not
>>spening
>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>
>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>
>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>
>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>
>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
with
>>>>
>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>>
>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>
>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.

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

>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>
>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>> Hi Bill,
>>>>>> You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
areas
>>>>>>
>>>>>> like
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot of
>>time
>>>>>>
>>>>>> But
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in Logic's
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the individual
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface design?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>>
>>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window
needs
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
>>>>>>

>>>>>> now,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where
>>>you
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
to
>>>drag
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> And
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been
excited
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes,
>>>the
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
>>>>>>
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
>in

>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is
>not
>>>>>>
>>>>>> as
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>I
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
Then,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
>are
>>>>you
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>range
>>>>>>
>>>>>> or
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best
>>midi
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
have
>>>>a
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And,
>>I
>>>>must
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the
>>>"State
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes..
So
>>>far,so
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>
>>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the
Posted by Dedric Terry on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 02:00:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Jamie,

That makes more sense - I couldn't see how Logic would have made it to 7 without sample accurate audio.

I can't speak for anything beyond 5.5, so take my comment with a grain of salt. Logic may in reality have most every editing feature Nuendo has, but to me, audio seemed easier in Nuendo after switching - that could be nothing more than subjective psychovisuals, but tools, visuals that contribute to how quickly I can analyze and edit an audio track, and at the time, much better crossfade editing options (5.5 was a bit limited there). Handling audio as events or clips, time warp, etc. are also nice features.

Probably the big missing feature (or so I hear - again, correct if wrong here), is plugin delay compensation on busses.

That said, there are some cool aspects to Logic that Nuendo doesn't have:
1 - more powerful midi (but to be fair, I haven't found anything I couldn't do in Nuendo, other than a complement to Logic's environment).
2 - dynamic processing allocation - not an official feature that I know of but one users have been asking for in Nuendo. The beauty here - start a song loaded with plugins and it doesn't max out the cpu until it reaches the point in the song it has to load that one last plugin - nice. Nuendo will sit there and stutter painfully until you can get a stop key through it's overloaded brain. The advantage of static (Nuendo) is reverb/delay processing - it continues after playback is stopped (used to be a problem with Logic, requiring dummy audio clips, but I'm sure that's fixed by now).
3 - Add audio tracks without affecting playback (Nuendo/SX have to mute playback while adding tracks, but that is probably a necessary tradeoff of full PDC).

I wouldn't say Logic is inadequate for audio, just a different approach, with its' own strengths and weaknesses like any other DAW. As long as I have full PDC I would be happy to mix a record on Logic.

Regards,
Dedric

On 1/19/06 3:13 PM, in article 43d00edb@linux, "Jamie K"
<Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> I used Logic on PC until moving to Nuendo. I never thought it was hard to
>> learn, but maybe I'm weird that way.
>> I agree with Lamont - it is probably the best sequencer out there. Audio,
>> not as nice as Nuendo, but certainly
>> workable. I still have a soft spot for Logic even though I don't use it
>> much.
>> Did I read right in this thread that it still doesn't have sample accurate
>> editing for audio?
>
> Hey Dedric, yep you read it but it was wrong...Logic 7.1 does have
> sample accurate editing.
>
> I continue to hear good things about Nuendo. What audio features do you
> think it has that Logic lacks?
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>>
>> As far as the new Macs go, I hope they are as fast as comparable PCs, and
>> priced competitively. Perhaps
>> then both companies would have level competition to force better operating
>> systems, hardware, apps, etc..
>> ...okay, I'm dreaming now...
>>
>> I can't see moving back to Logic just for the new Apogee hardware, but I
>> like the concept and claims of tight
>> integration with Logic. I guess Apple really is serious about pro audio
>> (either that or Apogee is hoping they are).
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by TCB on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 03:35:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Jamie,

Do you program? I barely program, I use Perl mostly for systems administration
and web/database stuff. That said, I program more than a lot of people do

and I have spent lots of team studying and learning from other programmers. Programmers tend to learn to code in one language. It's just human nature to leverage whatever knowledge one might have to the greatest extent possible. For example, most CGI web scripting is done in Perl. It's not that Perl is inherently BEST for taking input from one page and spitting it out another, but it's a damn fine text parsing language and for accidental historical reasons it found its way into web servers early on. So most CGI programming is done in Perl. But a really good friend of mine is a really hotshot C programmer so his web site has all of the CGI done in C. He just puts a C compiler in a directory that can be executed by Apache and writes everything that way. I ooohed and aaahed over this (C has a much greater geek street cred than Perl) and he said, "Look, I'm just too damn lazy to learn Perl."

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

Now then, let's say I AM that C programmer who also happens to know how to program the Altivec unit. Bully for me. But every single line of code for the Altivec unit will have to be re-written for an Intel processor. I can't even stuff it down the drain of my Intel C compiler and get lower performing, but still working, programs. Nope, I have to write the same routines in C or using the Intel "vector processor" to do the same job. So now I have to know three languages, or I have to re-write all of the Altivec code again in C for the other platform. So, I'm writing along, worrying about my mortgage, hoping to sell some copies of the TCB Reverb Plug-in to both Mac and Windows users and I get to a spot where I can use Altivec or not. What do you think I'm going to do? Would you do the same?

Apple and Adobe, of course, are huge software houses way more than 1000 times
the size of, say, PSP Audio. They can probably afford the time to have some
of the coders work on very specialized areas where vectorization will really
matter. But the primary reason I can't believe the Altivec unit is greatly
exploited is because it is so incrediby powerful. If it *were* used a lot
Macs really would be a lot more powerful than PCs in certain situations.
The places where that does happen are in academic situations where people
code specifically for the processor they're using, stuff like weather research
and wave mechanics and so on.

Lastly, the word I hear is that Windows compilers aren't that much better
than Mac compilers. That is, the SSE units mostly sit around with nothing
to do, which is why the FPU on the chip is still the only meaningful benchmark
when looking at audio/video work. So, yes, people are developing for Altivec,
but that doesn't have much to do with what happens when people start working
with audio on a computer.

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>For anyone interested here's the wikopedia link:
>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AltiVec
>
>Poking around on the net, it looks like folks developing for AltiVec
>include Red Hat and Yellowdog Linux.
>
>On the Mac, Apple does, as you say. True, they ONLY make comprehensive
>tools for writing, presenting, recording, editing, animating,
>compositing, etc. So I agree it's a VERY limited universe of merely
>everything you need to produce media content...
>
>Except you might also need Adobe apps, wait, Adobe uses AltiVec, too.
>What about Microsoft. Bet they use AltiVec, too. Are there others?
>Probably a bunch. Google and see.
>
>So it's probably not as dire as all that. I'll betcha Adobe uses the SSE

>stuff on Intel/Athlon, so cross-platform development isn't out of the
>question. SSE is there on the new Macs, BTW.
>
>But forget all the AltiVec/SSE stuff, where OSX gets really cool is the

>core image stuff for real time media stuff running on the GPU. Crazy.
>
>Anyhoo,
> -Jamie

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

>>>all be a moot point.
>>>
>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>>>
>>>James
>>>
>>>
>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>Hi James..
>>>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
core
>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>>>
>>>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that
were
>>>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb),
and
>>>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec
>>>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
>>>
>>>velocity
>>>
>>>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing
to
>>>>do"..
>>>>
>>>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a
year
>>>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>>>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>>>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX
came
>>>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>>>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>>>
>>>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They
(Mr
>>>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any
longer.
>>>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>>>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity
engine..Becuase
>>>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics
>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and

the
>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>
>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
>>>>LaMont
>>>>
>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>
>> news.
>>
>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
>>
>> new
>>
>>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
processor
>>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the
tests
>>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>>
>>
>>>In
>>>
>>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>>
>>>>in
>>>>
>>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>>
>>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>>>
>>>>is
>>>>
>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>>
>> media
>>
>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for
multi
>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite

>>
>> factor
>>
>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
core
>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
>>>
>>>processor
>>>
>>>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>>>>
>>>>will
>>>>
>>>>>tell on all this.
>>>>>
>>>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>>>
>>>>>James
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>Jamie,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>>>
>>>>>But,
>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>>>
>>>LE
>>>
>>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>>>
>>>way
>>>
>>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>>>
>>>fairly
>>>
>>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>>>

>>>fast
>>>
>>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>>
>> setup
>>
>>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>>
>>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
>>
>> behind
>>
>>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>>users
>>>>>
>>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>>>
>>>would
>>>
>>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and
upgraded
>>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>>
>>>>>burn
>>>>>
>>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain
version
>>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>>>
>>>>>most
>>>>>
>>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>>
>> upgrade
>>
>>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>>>
>>>make
>>>

>>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead
of
>>>>
>>>>it
>>>>
>>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>>
>>>>changes,
>>>>
>>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time
user
>>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to
see.
>>>>>
>>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>>>
>>>>Apple
>>>>
>>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>>>
>>>>layout
>>>>
>>>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
the
>>>>
>>>>future
>>>>
>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm
not
>>>>
>>>>spening
>>>>
>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>

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

>>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and
>>
>> 3rd
>>
>>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete
set
>>>>
>>>>of
>>>>
>>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed

>>>>>
>>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click

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

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

>>>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving
regions
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very
fast.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>And
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been
>>
>> excited
>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997.
Yes,
>>>>>
>>>>>the
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in
league
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
>>>
>>>in
>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine
is
>>>
>>>not
>>>
>>>>>>>>as
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
>>
>> Then,
>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
>>>
>>>are
>>>
>>>>>>you
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>>>
>>>range
>>>
>>>>>>>>>or
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best
>>>>
>>>>midi
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
>>
>> have
>>
>>>>>>a
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And,
>>>>
>>>>I
>>>>
>>>>>>must
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about
the
>>>>>

>>>>>"State
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes..
>>
>> So
>>
>>>>>far,so
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Michele Hobbs on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 04:53:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric Terry wrote:

>
> Probably the big missing feature (or so I hear - again, correct if wrong
> here), is plugin delay compensation on busses.

Logic has had plug-in delay compensation on the busses since version 7.0
or 7.1. They were rather late to the party, though.

-Michele Hobbs

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the
Posted by Dedric Terry on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 06:16:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Good to know - I haven't kept up, so I'm just as late to the party.

Regards,

Dedric

On 1/19/06 9:53 PM, in article 43d06d35@linux, "Michele Hobbs" <michelehobbs@comcast.net> wrote:

> Dedric Terry wrote:
>
>>
>> Probably the big missing feature (or so I hear - again, correct if wrong
>> here), is plugin delay compensation on busses.
>
> Logic has had plug-in delay compensation on the busses since version 7.0
> or 7.1. They were rather late to the party, though.
>
>
> -Michele Hobbs

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 08:13:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dedric Terry wrote:
> Hey Jamie,
>
> That makes more sense - I couldn't see how Logic would have made it to 7
> without sample accurate audio.
>
> I can't speak for anything beyond 5.5, so take my comment with a grain of
> salt.

I'll see if I can bring you up to date. :^)

> Logic may in reality have most every editing feature Nuendo has, but
> to me, audio seemed easier in Nuendo after switching - that could be nothing
> more than subjective psychovisuals, but tools, visuals that contribute to
> how quickly I can analyze and edit an audio track, and at the time, much
> better crossfade editing options (5.5 was a bit limited there). Handling
> audio as events or clips, time warp, etc. are also nice features.

They added new crossfade options to Logic. Version 6 or 7, I forget
which but I was glad to see it. You can just drag across adjacent
regions and can also edit numerically.

> Probably the big missing feature (or so I hear - again, correct if wrong
> here), is plugin delay compensation on busses.

Added in 7.1: "Full Native Plug-In Delay Compensation
Take advantage of full plug-in delay compensation which now corrects for latency produced on bus, auxiliary, and output channels in addition to every other path in the native audio mixer. You'll especially appreciate this enhancement if you own third party DSP cards like those developed by Universal Audio and TC Electronics." (From http://docs.info.apple.com/article.html?artnum=301426)

I agree that Logic 5.x had limitations but they've been steadily addressing them.

Here's an article about version 7 you may find interesting:

http://www.tweakheadz.com/review_of_logic_pro_7.htm

Apple's lists of 7 and 7.1 improvements:
http://images.apple.com/logicpro/pdf/LogicPro7_PO.pdf
http://manuals.info.apple.com/en/Improvements_in_Logic_Pro_7 .1.pdf

> That said, there are some cool aspects to Logic that Nuendo doesn't have:
> 1 - more powerful midi (but to be fair, I haven't found anything I couldn't
> do in Nuendo, other than a complement to Logic's environment).
> 2 - dynamic processing allocation - not an official feature that I know of
> but one users have been asking for in Nuendo. The beauty here - start a
> song loaded with plugins and it doesn't max out the cpu until it reaches the
> point in the song it has to load that one last plugin - nice. Nuendo will
> sit there and stutter painfully until you can get a stop key through it's
> overloaded brain. The advantage of static (Nuendo) is reverb/delay
> processing - it continues after playback is stopped (used to be a problem
> with Logic, requiring dummy audio clips, but I'm sure that's fixed by now).

I think that's fixed.

> 3 - Add audio tracks without affecting playback (Nuendo/SX have to mute
> playback while adding tracks, but that is probably a necessary tradeoff of
> full PDC).

You can do pretty much anything in Logic without stopping playback. I don't think I've ever added tracks during playback, I'll have to try that.

> I wouldn't say Logic is inadequate for audio, just a different approach,
> with its' own strengths and weaknesses like any other DAW. As long as I
> have full PDC I would be happy to mix a record on Logic.

Anyone who remembers Logic from version 5.x on Wi95 or OS9 would
probably be glad to see the improvements made since then. Onward and upward.

BTW, Logic 7.2 will run on Intel OSX next month, so they say. $50 upgrade.

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

> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 1/19/06 3:13 PM, in article 43d00edb@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Dedric Terry wrote:
>>
>>>I used Logic on PC until moving to Nuendo. I never thought it was hard to
>>>learn, but maybe I'm weird that way.
>>>I agree with Lamont - it is probably the best sequencer out there. Audio,
>>>not as nice as Nuendo, but certainly
>>>workable. I still have a soft spot for Logic even though I don't use it
>>>much.
>>>Did I read right in this thread that it still doesn't have sample accurate
>>>editing for audio?
>>
>>Hey Dedric, yep you read it but it was wrong...Logic 7.1 does have
>>sample accurate editing.
>>
>>I continue to hear good things about Nuendo. What audio features do you
>>think it has that Logic lacks?
>>
>>Cheers,
>>-Jamie
>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>>As far as the new Macs go, I hope they are as fast as comparable PCs, and
>>>priced competitively. Perhaps
>>>then both companies would have level competition to force better operating
>>>systems, hardware, apps, etc..
>>>...okay, I'm dreaming now...
>>>
>>>I can't see moving back to Logic just for the new Apogee hardware, but I
>>>like the concept and claims of tight

>>>integration with Logic. I guess Apple really is serious about pro audio
>>>(either that or Apogee is hoping they are).
>>>
>>>Regards,
>>>Dedric
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 08:46:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Thad,

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

I use Revolution when I need to whip something up:
http://www.runrev.com/ - xtalk based. Whether that's "real programming"
depends on the crowd you run with. I got into xtalk languages when I
wrote the documentation for HyperSense on the NeXT computer.

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

Links:
http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/
http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html
http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Concept
ual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_secti on_1.html
http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?
topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm
http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562 &f=8300945231&m=8790959504
http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585
http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html
http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#c ateg1

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

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

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

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

>>
>>So it's probably not as dire as all that. I'll betcha Adobe uses the SSE
>
>
>>stuff on Intel/Athlon, so cross-platform development isn't out of the
>>question. SSE is there on the new Macs, BTW.
>>
>>But forget all the AltiVec/SSE stuff, where OSX gets really cool is the
>
>
>>core image stuff for real time media stuff running on the GPU. Crazy.
>>
>>Anyhoo,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>TCB wrote:
>>
>>>Pretty much the only apps that use Altivec are written by Apple (and run
>
> only
>
>>>on Macs) or are specially coded apps used written by research labs and
>
> such
>
>>>that write their own code. Anyone trying to support multiple platforms
>
> would
>
>>>be absolutely foolish to code for a (difficult to work with) vector unit
>>>only on one platform.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of Altivec, and
>>>>some plugin manufactures use it. Altivec was not necessary for Paris
>
> because
>
>>>>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
>>>>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple, or
>
> a

>
>>>>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if
>
> anybody
>
>>>>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>>>>
>>>>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in the
>>>>way of their opinions!!!!!
>>>>
>>>>Some use of Altivec.
>>>>
>>>>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having Altivec.
>>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html
>>>>
>>>>Steinberg 2002
>>>> http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR /Cubase-VST-51.html
>>>>
>>>>http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec
>>>>
>>>>Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move to
>>>
>>>dual
>>>
>>>
>>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture, it
>>>
>>>may
>>>
>>>
>>>>all be a moot point.
>>>>
>>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>>>>
>>>>James
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Hi James..
>>>>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>
> core
>
>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>>>>

>>>>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that
>
> were
>
>>>>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb),
>
> and
>
>>>>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec
>>>>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the
>>>>
>>>>velocity
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing
>
> to
>
>>>>>do"..
>>>>>
>>>>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>>>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>>>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a
>
> year
>
>>>>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>>>>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>>>>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX
>
> came
>
>>>>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>>>>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>>>>
>>>>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They
>
> (Mr
>
>>>>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any
>
> longer.
>
>>>>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>>>>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity
>
> engine..Becuase
>

>>>>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics
>>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and
>
> the
>
>>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>>
>>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>
>>>news.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
>>>
>>>new
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
>
> processor
>
>>>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the
>
> tests
>
>>>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>>>
>>>
>>>>In
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>>>
>>>>>in
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>>>

>>>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>>>>
>>>>>is
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>>>
>>>media
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for
>
> multi
>
>>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
>>>
>>>factor
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>
> core
>
>>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one
>>>>
>>>>processor
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time
>>>>>
>>>>>will
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>tell on all this.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do,
>>>>
>>>>and
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>James
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:

>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Jamie,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>But,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>>>>
>>>>LE
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>>>>
>>>>way
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>>>>
>>>>fairly
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>>>>
>>>>fast
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>>>
>>>setup
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>>>>
>>>>and
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>>>
>>>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
>>>
>>>behind
>>>
>>>

>>>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>users
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>>>>
>>>>would
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and
>
> upgraded
>
>>>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>burn
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain
>
> version
>
>>>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>>>>
>>>>>>most
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>>>
>>>upgrade
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>>>>
>>>>make
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead
>
> of
>
>>>>>it

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>>>
>>>>>changes,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time
>
> user
>
>>>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to
>
> see.
>
>>>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>>>>
>>>>>Apple
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>>>>
>>>>>layout
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
>
> the
>
>>>>>future
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm
>
> not
>
>>>>>spening
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>>
>>>with
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a
>
> handle
>
>>>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>>>>
>>>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they
>
> could
>
>>>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and
>
> they
>
>>>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>
>>>but
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
>
>
>>>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and
>>>

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

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
>>>
>>>areas
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>like
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot
>
> of
>
>>>>>time
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>But
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in
>
> Logic's
>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the
>
> individual
>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface
>
> design?
>
>>>>>>>>>It
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window
>>>
>>>needs
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it
>
> works
>
>>>>>>>>>now,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where
>>>>>>
>>>>>>you
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
>>>
>>>to
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>drag
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving
>
> regions
>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very
>
> fast.
>
>>>>>>>>>And
>>>>>>>>>

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

>>>>not
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>as
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
>>>>
>>>Then,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And
>>>>
>>>>are
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>>>>
>>>>range
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>or
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best
>>>>>
>>>>>midi
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
>>>
>>>have
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>a
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry. And,
>>>>>
>>>>>I
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>must

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about
>
> the
>
>>>>>>"State
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes..
>>>
>>>So
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>far,so
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by TCB on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 15:24:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ah, the Perl/Python debate. If anyone other than Jamie is reading this the flame wars among coders on that one make Mac/PC and Pro Tools/PARIS debates look like very friendly chats by people who respect each other. I didn't even look at Python until I found out Bram Cohen used it, and now Google uses it internally a lot. These days if Google used COBOL I'm sure half the programmers on the planet would start using it. For me and what I do, and this is just for me other people have well informed and sensible opinions otherwise, Python is Perl but it reads better. To me that's not a compelling reason to make a move, but if I were starting over now? If Bram uses it? I dunno. The other Perl like language that I find really fascinating is Ruby. It has an interactive interpreter (like Python and VB), is strictly OO, and

forces such readable code that commenting should take half the time (or less) than doing the same thing in Perl. So I've been blinking bashfully in the direction of Ruby for a while now but don't think I'll be using Python any time soon.

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

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>Hi Thad,
>
>My friends who do that kind of stuff swear by python.
>
>I use Revolution when I need to whip something up:
>http://www.runrev.com/ - xtalk based. Whether that's "real programming"

>depends on the crowd you run with. I got into xtalk languages when I
>wrote the documentation for HyperSense on the NeXT computer.
>
>As far as altivec programming, you may be right about it being
>difficult. So was optimizing with assembly language, but programmers at

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

>may slow or stop some companies but there are already enough companies
>that take advantage of altivec it to show it's quite doable. And not
>just in academia, although that's a great place to use it too.
>
>Links:
>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/
>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html
> http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Concept
ual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_secti on_1.html
> http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?
topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm
> http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562 &f=8300945231&m=8790959504
>http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585
>http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html
> http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#c ateg1

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

>to dismiss out of hand.
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>
>TCB wrote:
>> Hey Jamie,
>>
>> Do you program? I barely program, I use Perl mostly for systems administration
>> and web/database stuff. That said, I program more than a lot of people
do
>> and I have spent lots of team studying and learning from other programmers.
>> Programmers tend to learn to code in one language. It's just human nature
>> to leverage whatever knowledge one might have to the greatest extent possible.
>> For example, most CGI web scripting is done in Perl. It's not that Perl
is
>> inherently BEST for taking input from one page and spitting it out another,
>> but it's a damn fine text parsing language and for accidental historical
>> reasons it found its way into web servers early on. So most CGI programming
>> is done in Perl. But a really good friend of mine is a really hotshot
C programmer
>> so his web site has all of the CGI done in C. He just puts a C compiler
in
>> a directory that can be executed by Apache and writes everything that
way.
>> I ooohed and aaahed over this (C has a much greater geek street cred than
>> Perl) and he said, "Look, I'm just too damn lazy to learn Perl."
>>
>> So, let's say I'm a C programmer working on my audio plug-in. If I'm using
>> a standard C compiler an programming for a Mac or a PC I don't really
think
>> much about which part of the processor is doing what number crunching.
The
>> compiler does that for me. When I have my program do some calculation
on
>> a sample stored as a 32 bit floating point number my compiler says, "Well,
>> this should obviously be done on the floating point unit in the CPU, let's

>> send it there." For me, as a Perl programmer, integers are actually converted
>> to floats automatically, which in some situations can lead to weird stuff
>> happening so there's an extra switch and module that is used in Perl if
someone
>> is doing important stuff like designing nukulor reactors or modeling the
>> historic volatility of emerging market debt vs. the treasuries. In any
case,
>> all of this goes on in the background with the compiler doing the work
for
>> me. With Altivec, though, the compilers just never really got there. So,
>> me as a C programmer would have to know at least one other language (and
>> the right language) to be able to code for that processor. That's like
me
>> writing a book about Cubase and then doing chapter 15 in Mandarin. Certainly
>> there are some people who could do that, but the percentage of people
in
>> the world who can write a book at all is pretty small, and the percentage
>> of those people who know even one foreign language at all is even smaller,
>> and the percentage of those who can write fluently in that second language
>> gets even smaller, and then even with five billion people on planet earht
>> it's going to be damn difficult to find too many people who can do that.
>>
>>
>> Now then, let's say I AM that C programmer who also happens to know how
to
>> program the Altivec unit. Bully for me. But every single line of code
for
>> the Altivec unit will have to be re-written for an Intel processor. I
can't
>> even stuff it down the drain of my Intel C compiler and get lower performing,
>> but still working, programs. Nope, I have to write the same routines in
C
>> or using the Intel "vector processor" to do the same job. So now I have
to
>> know three languages, or I have to re-write all of the Altivec code again
>> in C for the other platform. So, I'm writing along, worrying about my
mortgage,
>> hoping to sell some copies of the TCB Reverb Plug-in to both Mac and Windows
>> users and I get to a spot where I can use Altivec or not. What do you
think
>> I'm going to do? Would you do the same?
>>
>> Apple and Adobe, of course, are huge software houses way more than 1000
times
>> the size of, say, PSP Audio. They can probably afford the time to have
some
>> of the coders work on very specialized areas where vectorization will
really

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

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

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

>>>question. SSE is there on the new Macs, BTW.
>>>
>>>But forget all the AltiVec/SSE stuff, where OSX gets really cool is the
>>
>>
>>>core image stuff for real time media stuff running on the GPU. Crazy.

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

the
>>>>>way of their opinions!!!!!
>>>>>
>>>>>Some use of Altivec.
>>>>>
>>>>>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having Altivec.
>>>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html
>>>>>
>>>>>Steinberg 2002
>>>>> http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR /Cubase-VST-51.html
>>>>>
>>>>>http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec
>>>>>
>>>>>Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move
to
>>>>
>>>>dual
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture,
it
>>>>
>>>>may
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>all be a moot point.
>>>>>
>>>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>>>>>
>>>>>James
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hi James..
>>>>>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>>
>> core
>>
>>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that
>>
>> were
>>
>>>>>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb),

>>
>> and
>>
>>>>>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe
Altivec
>>>>>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use
the
>>>>>
>>>>>velocity
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing
>>
>> to
>>
>>>>>>do"..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to
"fabricate"
>>>>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>>>>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know,
a
>>
>> year
>>
>>>>>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology,
Apple
>>>>>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were
counting
>>>>>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX
>>
>> came
>>
>>>>>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely
hang
>>>>>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They
>>
>> (Mr
>>
>>>>>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any
>>
>> longer.
>>
>>>>>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see
their
>>>>>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity

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

>>>>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>>>>
>>>>>>in
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the
iMac
>>>>>>
>>>>>>is
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>>>>
>>>>media
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for
>>
>> multi
>>
>>>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
>>>>
>>>>factor
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>>
>> core
>>
>>>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is
one
>>>>>
>>>>>processor
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure.
 Time
>>>>>>
>>>>>>will
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>tell on all this.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you

do,
>>>>>
>>>>>and
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>James
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Jamie,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>But,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>>>>>
>>>>>LE
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng
the
>>>>>
>>>>>way
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can
mix
>>>>>
>>>>>fairly
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>>>>>
>>>>>fast
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>>>>
>>>>setup
>>>>

>>>>
>>>>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>>>>>
>>>>>and
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
>>>>
>>>>behind
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a
lot
>>>>
>>>>of
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>users
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill..
You
>>>>>
>>>>>would
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and
>>
>> upgraded
>>
>>>>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>burn
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain
>>
>> version
>>
>>>>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly,
today
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>most
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>>>>
>>>>upgrade
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and
thus
>>>>>
>>>>>make
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>>>it
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>>>>
>>>>>changes,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time
>>
>> user
>>
>>>>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to
>>
>> see.
>>
>>>>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems
that
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Apple
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack
Pro's
>>>>>>
>>>>>>layout
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing

>>
>> the
>>
>>>>>>future
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm
>>
>> not
>>
>>>>>>spening
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's

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

>> could
>>
>>>>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design

>>>>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and
>>
>> they
>>
>>>>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment
window
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to
do.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>>
>>>>but
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability
to
>>
>>
>>>>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included
and
>>>>
>>>>3rd
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio

>>>>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete
>>
>> set
>>
>>>>>>of
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could
indeed
>>>>>>>

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

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

>>
>> works
>>
>>>>>>>>>>>now,
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info
where
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
>>>>
>>>>to
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>drag
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving
>>
>> regions
>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very
>>
>> fast.
>>
>>>>>>>>>>>And
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been

>>>>
>>>>excited
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997.
>>
>> Yes,
>>
>>>>>>>the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in
>>
>> league
>>
>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
>>>>>
>>>>>in
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine
>>
>> is
>>
>>>>>>not
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>as
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
>>>>
>>>>Then,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are
steller..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine?
And
>>>>>
>>>>>are
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>>>>>
>>>>>range
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>or
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the
best
>>>>>>
>>>>>>midi
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
>>>>
>>>>have
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>a
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry.
And,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>must
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about
>>
>> the
>>
>>>>>>>"State
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes..
>>>>
>>>>So
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>far,so
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by John [1] on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 19:34:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ruby eats perl and python for breakfast. hehe couldn't resist.

TCB wrote:
> Ah, the Perl/Python debate. If anyone other than Jamie is reading this the
> flame wars among coders on that one make Mac/PC and Pro Tools/PARIS debates
> look like very friendly chats by people who respect each other. I didn't
> even look at Python until I found out Bram Cohen used it, and now Google
> uses it internally a lot. These days if Google used COBOL I'm sure half the
> programmers on the planet would start using it. For me and what I do, and
> this is just for me other people have well informed and sensible opinions
> otherwise, Python is Perl but it reads better. To me that's not a compelling
> reason to make a move, but if I were starting over now? If Bram uses it?
> I dunno. The other Perl like language that I find really fascinating is Ruby.
> It has an interactive interpreter (like Python and VB), is strictly OO, and
> forces such readable code that commenting should take half the time (or less)
> than doing the same thing in Perl. So I've been blinking bashfully in the
> direction of Ruby for a while now but don't think I'll be using Python any
> time soon.
>
> Anywho, I read your links and one in particular stood out. It was the link
> to the page with the books available. The title of the Altivec section was

> "Learning Assembly and Altivec." Which matches my understanding that unless
> someone can program PPC assembly there's no real way to write good Altivec
> code. Yes, there are some programmers who are nasty with assembly. Yes, some
> of them work for audio companies. But badass assebmly programmers are not
> everyday creatures, which I would rank as the primary reason not a lot of
> apps use that part of the PPC processor. But I'm probably nuts anyway.
>
> TCB
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>>Hi Thad,
>>
>>My friends who do that kind of stuff swear by python.
>>
>>I use Revolution when I need to whip something up:
>>http://www.runrev.com/ - xtalk based. Whether that's "real programming"
>
>
>>depends on the crowd you run with. I got into xtalk languages when I
>>wrote the documentation for HyperSense on the NeXT computer.
>>
>>As far as altivec programming, you may be right about it being
>>difficult. So was optimizing with assembly language, but programmers at
>
>
>>that level aren't phased by the things we mortals see as "difficult." It
>
>
>>may slow or stop some companies but there are already enough companies
>>that take advantage of altivec it to show it's quite doable. And not
>>just in academia, although that's a great place to use it too.
>>
>>Links:
>>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/
>>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html
>> http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Concept
ual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_secti on_1.html
>> http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?
topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm
>> http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562 &f=8300945231&m=8790959504
>>http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585
>>http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html
>> http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#c ateg1
>>
>>I think some of the impressive performance of the audio, graphics and
>>video production software I use on a dual G5 can be attributed to
>>altivec support. So no, I don't think floating point is the only

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

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

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

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

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

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

>>>>>>all be a moot point.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>>>>>>
>>>>>>James
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Hi James..
>>>>>>>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>>>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>>>
>>>core
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that
>>>
>>>were
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb),
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe
>
> Altivec
>
>>>>>>>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use
>
> the
>
>>>>>>velocity
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing
>>>
>>>to
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>do"..

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to
>
> "fabricate"
>
>>>>>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>>>>>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know,
>
> a
>
>>>year
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology,
>
> Apple
>
>>>>>>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were
>
> counting
>
>>>>>>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX
>>>
>>>came
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely
>
> hang
>
>>>>>>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They
>>>
>>>(Mr
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any
>>>
>>>longer.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see
>
> their
>
>>>>>>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity
>>>

>>>engine..Becuase
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most
>
> graphics
>
>>>>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>>>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the
>
> CPU..??
>
>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>>>
>>>>>news.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs
>
> said.
>
>>>>>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
>>>>>
>>>>>new
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>>>>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
>>>
>>>processor
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the

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

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>>>
>>>core
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is
>
> one
>
>>>>>>processor
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure.
>
> Time
>
>>>>>>>will
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>tell on all this.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you
>
> do,
>
>>>>>>and
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>James
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Jamie,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>But,
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>>>>>>
>>>>>>LE
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng
>
> the
>
>>>>>>way
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can
>
> mix
>
>>>>>>fairly
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>fast
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>>>>>
>>>>>setup
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>and
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
>>>>>

>>>>>behind
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a
>
> lot
>
>>>>>of
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>users
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill..
>
> You
>
>>>>>>would
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and
>>>
>>>upgraded
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>burn
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain
>>>
>>>version
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly,
>
> today
>
>>>>>>>>most
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>>>>>
>>>>>upgrade
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and
>
> thus
>
>>>>>>make
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>it
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>changes,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>>>>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time
>>>
>>>user
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to
>>>
>>>see.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems
>
> that
>

>>>>>>>Apple
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack
>
> Pro's
>
>>>>>>>layout
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>future
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm
>>>
>>>not
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>spening
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>
>
>>>>>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>>>>
>>>>>with

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you
>
> suggest
>
>>>>>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of
>
> a
>
>>>handle
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably
>
> well
>
>>>>>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they
>>>
>>>could
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>
>
>>>>>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and
>>>
>>>they
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment
>
> window
>
>>>>>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to
>
> do.
>
>>>>>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>>>
>>>>>but

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

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

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

>>>>>>>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As
>
> it
>
>>>works
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>now,
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info
>
> where
>
>>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
>>>>>
>>>>>to
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>drag
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving
>>>
>>>regions
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very
>>>
>>>fast.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>And
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.

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

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine
>>>
>>>is
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>not
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>as
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
>>>>>
>>>>>Then,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are
>
> steller..
>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine?
>
> And
>
>>>>>>are

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

>
>>>>>>>midi
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
>>>>>
>>>>>have
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>a
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry.
>
> And,
>
>>>>>>>I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>must
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>"State
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

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

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by Jamie K on Fri, 20 Jan 2006 23:34:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah, probably. ;^)

Join the club...

The types of uber-programmers who can handle Altivec/SSE stuff exist in
sufficient numbers. No worries. Good luck with Ruby, sounds cool.

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

TCB wrote:
> Ah, the Perl/Python debate. If anyone other than Jamie is reading this the
> flame wars among coders on that one make Mac/PC and Pro Tools/PARIS debates
> look like very friendly chats by people who respect each other. I didn't
> even look at Python until I found out Bram Cohen used it, and now Google
> uses it internally a lot. These days if Google used COBOL I'm sure half the
> programmers on the planet would start using it. For me and what I do, and
> this is just for me other people have well informed and sensible opinions
> otherwise, Python is Perl but it reads better. To me that's not a compelling
> reason to make a move, but if I were starting over now? If Bram uses it?
> I dunno. The other Perl like language that I find really fascinating is Ruby.

> It has an interactive interpreter (like Python and VB), is strictly OO, and
> forces such readable code that commenting should take half the time (or less)
> than doing the same thing in Perl. So I've been blinking bashfully in the
> direction of Ruby for a while now but don't think I'll be using Python any
> time soon.
>
> Anywho, I read your links and one in particular stood out. It was the link
> to the page with the books available. The title of the Altivec section was
> "Learning Assembly and Altivec." Which matches my understanding that unless
> someone can program PPC assembly there's no real way to write good Altivec
> code. Yes, there are some programmers who are nasty with assembly. Yes, some
> of them work for audio companies. But badass assebmly programmers are not
> everyday creatures, which I would rank as the primary reason not a lot of
> apps use that part of the PPC processor. But I'm probably nuts anyway.
>
> TCB
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>>Hi Thad,
>>
>>My friends who do that kind of stuff swear by python.
>>
>>I use Revolution when I need to whip something up:
>>http://www.runrev.com/ - xtalk based. Whether that's "real programming"
>
>
>>depends on the crowd you run with. I got into xtalk languages when I
>>wrote the documentation for HyperSense on the NeXT computer.
>>
>>As far as altivec programming, you may be right about it being
>>difficult. So was optimizing with assembly language, but programmers at
>
>
>>that level aren't phased by the things we mortals see as "difficult." It
>
>
>>may slow or stop some companies but there are already enough companies
>>that take advantage of altivec it to show it's quite doable. And not
>>just in academia, although that's a great place to use it too.
>>
>>Links:
>>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/
>>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html
>> http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Concept
ual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_secti on_1.html
>> http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?
topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm

>> http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562 &f=8300945231&m=8790959504
>>http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585
>>http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html
>> http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#c ateg1
>>
>>I think some of the impressive performance of the audio, graphics and
>>video production software I use on a dual G5 can be attributed to
>>altivec support. So no, I don't think floating point is the only
>>meaningful benchmark. Also the GPU is increasingly coming into play
>>under OSX. As to how many programmers can handle altivec programming,
>>we'd both only be speculating. My answer: enough to matter and too many
>
>
>>to dismiss out of hand.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>TCB wrote:
>>
>>>Hey Jamie,
>>>
>>>Do you program? I barely program, I use Perl mostly for systems administration
>>>and web/database stuff. That said, I program more than a lot of people
>
> do
>
>>>and I have spent lots of team studying and learning from other programmers.
>>>Programmers tend to learn to code in one language. It's just human nature
>>>to leverage whatever knowledge one might have to the greatest extent possible.
>>>For example, most CGI web scripting is done in Perl. It's not that Perl
>
> is
>
>>>inherently BEST for taking input from one page and spitting it out another,
>>>but it's a damn fine text parsing language and for accidental historical
>>>reasons it found its way into web servers early on. So most CGI programming
>>>is done in Perl. But a really good friend of mine is a really hotshot
>
> C programmer
>
>>>so his web site has all of the CGI done in C. He just puts a C compiler
>
> in
>

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

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

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

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

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

>>>>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture,
>
> it
>
>>>>>may
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>all be a moot point.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>>>>>>
>>>>>>James
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Hi James..
>>>>>>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>>>
>>>core
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that
>>>
>>>were
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb),
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe
>
> Altivec
>
>>>>>>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use
>
> the
>
>>>>>>velocity
>>>>>>

>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing
>>>
>>>to
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>do"..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to
>
> "fabricate"
>
>>>>>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>>>>>>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know,
>
> a
>
>>>year
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology,
>
> Apple
>
>>>>>>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were
>
> counting
>
>>>>>>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX
>>>
>>>came
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely
>
> hang
>
>>>>>>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They
>>>
>>>(Mr
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any
>>>
>>>longer.

>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see
>
> their
>
>>>>>>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity
>>>
>>>engine..Becuase
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most
>
> graphics
>
>>>>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>>>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the
>
> CPU..??
>
>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>>>
>>>>>news.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs
>
> said.
>
>>>>>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
>>>>>
>>>>>new
>>>>>
>>>>>

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

>>>multi
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
>>>>>
>>>>>factor
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>>>
>>>core
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is
>
> one
>
>>>>>>processor
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure.
>
> Time
>
>>>>>>>will
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>tell on all this.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you
>
> do,
>
>>>>>>and
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>James
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Jamie,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>But,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>>>>>>
>>>>>>LE
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng
>
> the
>
>>>>>>way
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can
>
> mix
>
>>>>>>fairly
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>fast
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>>>>>
>>>>>setup
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>>>>>>

>>>>>>and
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
>>>>>
>>>>>behind
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a
>
> lot
>
>>>>>of
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>users
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill..
>
> You
>
>>>>>>would
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and
>>>
>>>upgraded
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>burn
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain
>>>
>>>version
>>>
>>>

>>>>>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly,
>
> today
>
>>>>>>>>most
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>>>>>
>>>>>upgrade
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and
>
> thus
>
>>>>>>make
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>it
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>changes,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>>>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time
>>>
>>>user
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to

>>>
>>>see.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems
>
> that
>
>>>>>>>Apple
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack
>
> Pro's
>
>>>>>>>layout
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>future
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm
>>>
>>>not
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>spening
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>

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

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to
>
> do.
>
>>>>>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>>>
>>>>>but
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability
>
> to
>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included
>
> and
>
>>>>>3rd
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>
>
>>>>>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete
>>>
>>>set
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could
>
> indeed
>
>>>>>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>
>>>

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

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

>>>>>>>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window
>>>>>
>>>>>needs
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As
>
> it
>
>>>works
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>now,
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info
>
> where
>
>>>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
>>>>>
>>>>>to
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>drag
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving
>>>
>>>regions
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very
>>>
>>>fast.

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

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

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine?
>
> And
>
>>>>>>are
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>lol
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>range
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>or
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the
>
> best
>
>>>>>>>midi
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
>>>>>
>>>>>have
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>a
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry.
>
> And,
>
>>>>>>>I
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>must
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>"State
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes..
>>>>>
>>>>>So
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>far,so
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the puzzle
Posted by TCB on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 00:29:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

John,

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

Anyway, thoughts and opinions would be appreciated,

TCB

John <no@no.com> wrote:
>Ruby eats perl and python for breakfast. hehe couldn't resist.
>
>TCB wrote:

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

>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>>Hi Thad,
>>>
>>>My friends who do that kind of stuff swear by python.
>>>
>>>I use Revolution when I need to whip something up:

>>>http://www.runrev.com/ - xtalk based. Whether that's "real programming"
>>
>>
>>>depends on the crowd you run with. I got into xtalk languages when I
>>>wrote the documentation for HyperSense on the NeXT computer.
>>>
>>>As far as altivec programming, you may be right about it being
>>>difficult. So was optimizing with assembly language, but programmers at
>>
>>
>>>that level aren't phased by the things we mortals see as "difficult."
It
>>
>>
>>>may slow or stop some companies but there are already enough companies

>>>that take advantage of altivec it to show it's quite doable. And not
>>>just in academia, although that's a great place to use it too.
>>>
>>>Links:
>>>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/
>>>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html
>>> http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Concept
ual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_secti on_1.html
>>> http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?
topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm
>>> http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562
&f=8300945231&m=8790959504
>>>http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585
>>>http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html
>>> http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#c ateg1
>>>
>>>I think some of the impressive performance of the audio, graphics and

>>>video production software I use on a dual G5 can be attributed to
>>>altivec support. So no, I don't think floating point is the only
>>>meaningful benchmark. Also the GPU is increasingly coming into play
>>>under OSX. As to how many programmers can handle altivec programming,

>>>we'd both only be speculating. My answer: enough to matter and too many
>>
>>
>>>to dismiss out of hand.
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>

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

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

>>
>> for
>>
>>>>the Altivec unit will have to be re-written for an Intel processor. I
>>
>> can't
>>
>>>>even stuff it down the drain of my Intel C compiler and get lower performing,
>>>>but still working, programs. Nope, I have to write the same routines
in
>>
>> C
>>
>>>>or using the Intel "vector processor" to do the same job. So now I have
>>
>> to
>>
>>>>know three languages, or I have to re-write all of the Altivec code again
>>>>in C for the other platform. So, I'm writing along, worrying about my
>>
>> mortgage,
>>
>>>>hoping to sell some copies of the TCB Reverb Plug-in to both Mac and
Windows
>>>>users and I get to a spot where I can use Altivec or not. What do you
>>
>> think
>>
>>>>I'm going to do? Would you do the same?
>>>>
>>>>Apple and Adobe, of course, are huge software houses way more than 1000
>>
>> times
>>
>>>>the size of, say, PSP Audio. They can probably afford the time to have
>>
>> some
>>
>>>>of the coders work on very specialized areas where vectorization will
>>
>> really
>>
>>>>matter. But the primary reason I can't believe the Altivec unit is greatly
>>>>exploited is because it is so incrediby powerful. If it *were* used a
>>
>> lot
>>
>>>>Macs really would be a lot more powerful than PCs in certain situations.

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

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

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

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

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

>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture,
>>
>> it
>>
>>>>>>may
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>all be a moot point.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>James
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Hi James..
>>>>>>>>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>>>>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual
>>>>
>>>>core
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that
>>>>
>>>>were
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb),
>>>>
>>>>and
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe
>>
>> Altivec
>>
>>>>>>>>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use
>>
>> the
>>

>>>>>>>velocity
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing
>>>>
>>>>to
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>do"..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to
>>
>> "fabricate"
>>
>>>>>>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while,
trying
>>>>>>>>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know,
>>
>> a
>>
>>>>year
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology,
>>
>> Apple
>>
>>>>>>>>was was lsoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were
>>
>> counting
>>
>>>>>>>>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When
OSX
>>>>
>>>>came
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely
>>
>> hang
>>
>>>>>>>>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly.
They
>>>>
>>>>(Mr

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face
any
>>>>
>>>>longer.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see
>>
>> their
>>
>>>>>>>>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity
>>>>
>>>>engine..Becuase
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most
>>
>> graphics
>>
>>>>>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD
and
>>>>
>>>>the
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain
significant
>>>>>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the
>>
>> CPU..??
>>
>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>>>>
>>>>>>news.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs

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

>>>>>>>>is
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro
multi
>>>>>>
>>>>>>media
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology
for
>>>>
>>>>multi
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole
equation
>>>>>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. Altivec is a definite
>>>>>>
>>>>>>factor
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with
dual
>>>>
>>>>core
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess
is
>>
>> one
>>
>>>>>>>processor
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>is handling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure.
>>
>> Time
>>
>>>>>>>>will
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>tell on all this.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you
>>
>> do,
>>
>>>>>>>and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>James
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Jamie,
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>But,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro
Tools
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>LE
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng
>>
>> the
>>
>>>>>>>way
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can
>>
>> mix
>>

>>>>>>>fairly
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as
sleek,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>fast
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>>>>>>
>>>>>>setup
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5
(2.5)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>and
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed
juice
>>>>>>
>>>>>>behind
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down
a
>>
>> lot
>>
>>>>>>of
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>users
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill..
>>

>> You
>>
>>>>>>>would
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5
and
>>>>
>>>>upgraded
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finaly" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>burn
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain
>>>>
>>>>version
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly,
>>
>> today
>>
>>>>>>>>>most
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>>>>>>
>>>>>>upgrade
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and
>>
>> thus
>>
>>>>>>>make
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead

>>>>
>>>>of
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>it
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>changes,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.

>>>>>>>>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time
>>>>
>>>>user
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like
to
>>>>
>>>>see.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems
>>
>> that
>>
>>>>>>>>>Apple
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack
>>
>> Pro's
>>
>>>>>>>>>layout
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>and audio engine is where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
>>>>
>>>>the

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

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

>>>>>>3rd
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's

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

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

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

>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>now,
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info
>>
>> where
>>
>>>>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
>>>>>>
>>>>>>to
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>drag
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving
>>>>
>>>>regions
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again,
very
>>>>
>>>>fast.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>And
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have
been
>>>>>>
>>>>>>excited
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997.
>>>>
>>>>Yes,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>the
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is
in
>>>>
>>>>league
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio
engine
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>in
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Cubase
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine
>>>>

>>>>is
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>not
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>as
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>only
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Then,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Appple
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are
>>
>> steller..
>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine?
>>
>> And
>>
>>>>>>>>are
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>

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

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
>>>>>>
>>>>>>have
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>a
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry.
>>
>> And,
>>
>>>>>>>>>I
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>must
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about
>>>>
>>>>the
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>"State
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>So
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>far,so
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 03:26:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for the update - sounds like the difference between Logic and Nuendo is a GUI.

One other nice part of Logic I would like to see in Nuendo is window layout handling somewhat independent of Windows. Vegas has a similar approach and dockable windows, in addition to recallable layouts. Just a better feel.

I might have to upgrade my PC version to 7, if I add an OSX machine to the growing herd of comps in the studio.

Regards,
Dedric

On 1/20/06 1:13 AM, in article 43d09b71@linux, "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> Hey Jamie,
>>
>> That makes more sense - I couldn't see how Logic would have made it to 7
>> without sample accurate audio.
>>
>> I can't speak for anything beyond 5.5, so take my comment with a grain of
>> salt.
>
> I'll see if I can bring you up to date. :^)

>
>
>> Logic may in reality have most every editing feature Nuendo has, but
>> to me, audio seemed easier in Nuendo after switching - that could be nothing
>> more than subjective psychovisuals, but tools, visuals that contribute to
>> how quickly I can analyze and edit an audio track, and at the time, much
>> better crossfade editing options (5.5 was a bit limited there). Handling
>> audio as events or clips, time warp, etc. are also nice features.
>
> They added new crossfade options to Logic. Version 6 or 7, I forget
> which but I was glad to see it. You can just drag across adjacent
> regions and can also edit numerically.
>
>
>> Probably the big missing feature (or so I hear - again, correct if wrong
>> here), is plugin delay compensation on busses.
>
> Added in 7.1: "Full Native Plug-In Delay Compensation
> Take advantage of full plug-in delay compensation which now corrects for
> latency produced on bus, auxiliary, and output channels in addition to
> every other path in the native audio mixer. You'll especially appreciate
> this enhancement if you own third party DSP cards like those developed
> by Universal Audio and TC Electronics." (From
> http://docs.info.apple.com/article.html?artnum=301426)
>
> I agree that Logic 5.x had limitations but they've been steadily
> addressing them.
>
> Here's an article about version 7 you may find interesting:
>
> http://www.tweakheadz.com/review_of_logic_pro_7.htm
>
> Apple's lists of 7 and 7.1 improvements:
> http://images.apple.com/logicpro/pdf/LogicPro7_PO.pdf
> http://manuals.info.apple.com/en/Improvements_in_Logic_Pro_7 .1.pdf
>
>
>> That said, there are some cool aspects to Logic that Nuendo doesn't have:
>> 1 - more powerful midi (but to be fair, I haven't found anything I couldn't
>> do in Nuendo, other than a complement to Logic's environment).
>> 2 - dynamic processing allocation - not an official feature that I know of
>> but one users have been asking for in Nuendo. The beauty here - start a
>> song loaded with plugins and it doesn't max out the cpu until it reaches the
>> point in the song it has to load that one last plugin - nice. Nuendo will
>> sit there and stutter painfully until you can get a stop key through it's
>> overloaded brain. The advantage of static (Nuendo) is reverb/delay
>> processing - it continues after playback is stopped (used to be a problem
>> with Logic, requiring dummy audio clips, but I'm sure that's fixed by now).

>
> I think that's fixed.
>
>
>> 3 - Add audio tracks without affecting playback (Nuendo/SX have to mute
>> playback while adding tracks, but that is probably a necessary tradeoff of
>> full PDC).
>
> You can do pretty much anything in Logic without stopping playback. I
> don't think I've ever added tracks during playback, I'll have to try that.
>
>
>> I wouldn't say Logic is inadequate for audio, just a different approach,
>> with its' own strengths and weaknesses like any other DAW. As long as I
>> have full PDC I would be happy to mix a record on Logic.
>
> Anyone who remembers Logic from version 5.x on Wi95 or OS9 would
> probably be glad to see the improvements made since then. Onward and upward.
>
> BTW, Logic 7.2 will run on Intel OSX next month, so they say. $50 upgrade.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>> On 1/19/06 3:13 PM, in article 43d00edb@linux, "Jamie K"
>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>
>>>> I used Logic on PC until moving to Nuendo. I never thought it was hard to
>>>> learn, but maybe I'm weird that way.
>>>> I agree with Lamont - it is probably the best sequencer out there. Audio,
>>>> not as nice as Nuendo, but certainly
>>>> workable. I still have a soft spot for Logic even though I don't use it
>>>> much.
>>>> Did I read right in this thread that it still doesn't have sample accurate
>>>> editing for audio?
>>>
>>> Hey Dedric, yep you read it but it was wrong...Logic 7.1 does have
>>> sample accurate editing.
>>>
>>> I continue to hear good things about Nuendo. What audio features do you

>>> think it has that Logic lacks?
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> As far as the new Macs go, I hope they are as fast as comparable PCs, and
>>>> priced competitively. Perhaps
>>>> then both companies would have level competition to force better operating
>>>> systems, hardware, apps, etc..
>>>> ...okay, I'm dreaming now...
>>>>
>>>> I can't see moving back to Logic just for the new Apogee hardware, but I
>>>> like the concept and claims of tight
>>>> integration with Logic. I guess Apple really is serious about pro audio
>>>> (either that or Apogee is hoping they are).
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 23:05:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It seems that they re-tweaked the entire program with this update. When we upgraded to Logic 7 along with purchasing dual CPU G5's, Logic 7 was not as steady as it's predecessors. Especially, if we used teh "Ultrabeat" plugin and Sculpture.

I'm not singling out Emagic, but Steignberg as well as, Motu. These companies bring out (SELL) these so -called updates, only to come up short. As a working pro, you actually loose productivity when you upgrade. This is a problem thu out our industry. Thus, the trust factor starts in. Which made me swear off Apple & Logic audio and Steingberg.

Mt question is: How do you loose fuctionality ,sometimes sound quality in an app, that a DAW manufacturer makes you pay for "being a guinea pig"??
This is really austounding of how many people just jump and run to update their stable working,$$money making systems to, updating to a bug infested "upgrade" revision 1.0??
Facsinating..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>Thanks for the update - sounds like the difference between Logic and Nuendo
>is a GUI.
>
>One other nice part of Logic I would like to see in Nuendo is window layout
>handling somewhat independent of Windows. Vegas has a similar approach
and
>dockable windows, in addition to recallable layouts. Just a better feel.
>
>I might have to upgrade my PC version to 7, if I add an OSX machine to the
>growing herd of comps in the studio.
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>On 1/20/06 1:13 AM, in article 43d09b71@linux, "Jamie K"
><Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> Hey Jamie,
>>>
>>> That makes more sense - I couldn't see how Logic would have made it to
7
>>> without sample accurate audio.
>>>
>>> I can't speak for anything beyond 5.5, so take my comment with a grain
of
>>> salt.
>>
>> I'll see if I can bring you up to date. :^)
>>
>>
>>> Logic may in reality have most every editing feature Nuendo has, but
>>> to me, audio seemed easier in Nuendo after switching - that could be
nothing
>>> more than subjective psychovisuals, but tools, visuals that contribute
to
>>> how quickly I can analyze and edit an audio track, and at the time, much
>>> better crossfade editing options (5.5 was a bit limited there). Handling
>>> audio as events or clips, time warp, etc. are also nice features.
>>
>> They added new crossfade options to Logic. Version 6 or 7, I forget
>> which but I was glad to see it. You can just drag across adjacent
>> regions and can also edit numerically.
>>
>>
>>> Probably the big missing feature (or so I hear - again, correct if wrong
>>> here), is plugin delay compensation on busses.

>>
>> Added in 7.1: "Full Native Plug-In Delay Compensation
>> Take advantage of full plug-in delay compensation which now corrects for
>> latency produced on bus, auxiliary, and output channels in addition to
>> every other path in the native audio mixer. You'll especially appreciate
>> this enhancement if you own third party DSP cards like those developed
>> by Universal Audio and TC Electronics." (From
>> http://docs.info.apple.com/article.html?artnum=301426)
>>
>> I agree that Logic 5.x had limitations but they've been steadily
>> addressing them.
>>
>> Here's an article about version 7 you may find interesting:
>>
>> http://www.tweakheadz.com/review_of_logic_pro_7.htm
>>
>> Apple's lists of 7 and 7.1 improvements:
>> http://images.apple.com/logicpro/pdf/LogicPro7_PO.pdf
>> http://manuals.info.apple.com/en/Improvements_in_Logic_Pro_7 .1.pdf
>>
>>
>>> That said, there are some cool aspects to Logic that Nuendo doesn't have:
>>> 1 - more powerful midi (but to be fair, I haven't found anything I couldn't
>>> do in Nuendo, other than a complement to Logic's environment).
>>> 2 - dynamic processing allocation - not an official feature that I know
of
>>> but one users have been asking for in Nuendo. The beauty here - start
a
>>> song loaded with plugins and it doesn't max out the cpu until it reaches
the
>>> point in the song it has to load that one last plugin - nice. Nuendo
will
>>> sit there and stutter painfully until you can get a stop key through
it's
>>> overloaded brain. The advantage of static (Nuendo) is reverb/delay
>>> processing - it continues after playback is stopped (used to be a problem
>>> with Logic, requiring dummy audio clips, but I'm sure that's fixed by
now).
>>
>> I think that's fixed.
>>
>>
>>> 3 - Add audio tracks without affecting playback (Nuendo/SX have to mute
>>> playback while adding tracks, but that is probably a necessary tradeoff
of
>>> full PDC).
>>
>> You can do pretty much anything in Logic without stopping playback. I

>> don't think I've ever added tracks during playback, I'll have to try that.
>>
>>
>>> I wouldn't say Logic is inadequate for audio, just a different approach,
>>> with its' own strengths and weaknesses like any other DAW. As long as
I
>>> have full PDC I would be happy to mix a record on Logic.
>>
>> Anyone who remembers Logic from version 5.x on Wi95 or OS9 would
>> probably be glad to see the improvements made since then. Onward and upward.
>>
>> BTW, Logic 7.2 will run on Intel OSX next month, so they say. $50 upgrade.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 1/19/06 3:13 PM, in article 43d00edb@linux, "Jamie K"
>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> I used Logic on PC until moving to Nuendo. I never thought it was
hard to
>>>>> learn, but maybe I'm weird that way.
>>>>> I agree with Lamont - it is probably the best sequencer out there.
 Audio,
>>>>> not as nice as Nuendo, but certainly
>>>>> workable. I still have a soft spot for Logic even though I don't use
it
>>>>> much.
>>>>> Did I read right in this thread that it still doesn't have sample accurate
>>>>> editing for audio?
>>>>
>>>> Hey Dedric, yep you read it but it was wrong...Logic 7.1 does have
>>>> sample accurate editing.
>>>>
>>>> I continue to hear good things about Nuendo. What audio features do
you
>>>> think it has that Logic lacks?
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie

>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> As far as the new Macs go, I hope they are as fast as comparable PCs,
and
>>>>> priced competitively. Perhaps
>>>>> then both companies would have level competition to force better operating
>>>>> systems, hardware, apps, etc..
>>>>> ...okay, I'm dreaming now...
>>>>>
>>>>> I can't see moving back to Logic just for the new Apogee hardware,
but I
>>>>> like the concept and claims of tight
>>>>> integration with Logic. I guess Apple really is serious about pro
audio
>>>>> (either that or Apogee is hoping they are).
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 22 Jan 2006 00:22:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I can't speak for Logic, but for me, updates aren't a problem, nor are they for many other pros I know. I've never had an upgrade cost me, or a client time or money. But I approach them wisely - not in the middle of a project, and I have a quick backup plan if something goes awry.

To answer your question: pros don't do this, so.....umm.... why did you guys upgrade if you didn't know it would be stable for you? A momentary lapse of reason? Blinded with science? Allured by the shiny pretty things? ;-)

While I agree that software is rarely, if ever "perfect", users aren't either. Sometimes how you view the product has as much or more to do with the user, or the perceptions we allow other people to influence us with than the product. It's a Burger King world - have it your way, perfectly, yesterday. ;-))

Users are the ones that push manufacturers for more features faster. I would wager that a large majority of users on any given DAW forum claiming to want a perfectly stable release, regardless of features and time in beta,

would be complaining about how late the release is, and how manufacturer XYZ
has more features. It's a sickness, but it isn't one permeating developers
- it's a user disease.

In response, we are starting gear addicts anonymous - GAA for short, which
is what we usually say when NAMM rolls around - "Dude... did you see the new
Korg/Roland/Yammy synth?? Gaaaaaaa!!!!!". ;-)

Regards,
Dedric

On 1/21/06 4:05 PM, in article 43d2b038$1@linux, "LaMont Davis"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> It seems that they re-tweaked the entire program with this update. When we
> upgraded to Logic 7 along with purchasing dual CPU G5's, Logic 7 was not
> as steady as it's predecessors. Especially, if we used teh "Ultrabeat" plugin
> and Sculpture.
>
> I'm not singling out Emagic, but Steignberg as well as, Motu. These companies
> bring out (SELL) these so -called updates, only to come up short. As a working
> pro, you actually loose productivity when you upgrade. This is a problem
> thu out our industry. Thus, the trust factor starts in. Which made me swear
> off Apple & Logic audio and Steingberg.
>
> Mt question is: How do you loose fuctionality ,sometimes sound quality in
> an app, that a DAW manufacturer makes you pay for "being a guinea pig"??
> This is really austounding of how many people just jump and run to update
> their stable working,$$money making systems to, updating to a bug infested
> "upgrade" revision 1.0??
> Facsinating..
>
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> Thanks for the update - sounds like the difference between Logic and Nuendo
>> is a GUI.
>>
>> One other nice part of Logic I would like to see in Nuendo is window layout
>> handling somewhat independent of Windows. Vegas has a similar approach
> and
>> dockable windows, in addition to recallable layouts. Just a better feel.
>>
>> I might have to upgrade my PC version to 7, if I add an OSX machine to the
>> growing herd of comps in the studio.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric

>>
>> On 1/20/06 1:13 AM, in article 43d09b71@linux, "Jamie K"
>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>> Hey Jamie,
>>>>
>>>> That makes more sense - I couldn't see how Logic would have made it to
> 7
>>>> without sample accurate audio.
>>>>
>>>> I can't speak for anything beyond 5.5, so take my comment with a grain
> of
>>>> salt.
>>>
>>> I'll see if I can bring you up to date. :^)
>>>
>>>
>>>> Logic may in reality have most every editing feature Nuendo has, but
>>>> to me, audio seemed easier in Nuendo after switching - that could be
> nothing
>>>> more than subjective psychovisuals, but tools, visuals that contribute
> to
>>>> how quickly I can analyze and edit an audio track, and at the time, much
>>>> better crossfade editing options (5.5 was a bit limited there). Handling
>>>> audio as events or clips, time warp, etc. are also nice features.
>>>
>>> They added new crossfade options to Logic. Version 6 or 7, I forget
>>> which but I was glad to see it. You can just drag across adjacent
>>> regions and can also edit numerically.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Probably the big missing feature (or so I hear - again, correct if wrong
>>>> here), is plugin delay compensation on busses.
>>>
>>> Added in 7.1: "Full Native Plug-In Delay Compensation
>>> Take advantage of full plug-in delay compensation which now corrects for
>>> latency produced on bus, auxiliary, and output channels in addition to
>>> every other path in the native audio mixer. You'll especially appreciate
>>> this enhancement if you own third party DSP cards like those developed
>>> by Universal Audio and TC Electronics." (From
>>> http://docs.info.apple.com/article.html?artnum=301426)
>>>
>>> I agree that Logic 5.x had limitations but they've been steadily
>>> addressing them.
>>>
>>> Here's an article about version 7 you may find interesting:
>>>

>>> http://www.tweakheadz.com/review_of_logic_pro_7.htm
>>>
>>> Apple's lists of 7 and 7.1 improvements:
>>> http://images.apple.com/logicpro/pdf/LogicPro7_PO.pdf
>>> http://manuals.info.apple.com/en/Improvements_in_Logic_Pro_7 .1.pdf
>>>
>>>
>>>> That said, there are some cool aspects to Logic that Nuendo doesn't have:
>>>> 1 - more powerful midi (but to be fair, I haven't found anything I couldn't
>>>> do in Nuendo, other than a complement to Logic's environment).
>>>> 2 - dynamic processing allocation - not an official feature that I know
> of
>>>> but one users have been asking for in Nuendo. The beauty here - start
> a
>>>> song loaded with plugins and it doesn't max out the cpu until it reaches
> the
>>>> point in the song it has to load that one last plugin - nice. Nuendo
> will
>>>> sit there and stutter painfully until you can get a stop key through
> it's
>>>> overloaded brain. The advantage of static (Nuendo) is reverb/delay
>>>> processing - it continues after playback is stopped (used to be a problem
>>>> with Logic, requiring dummy audio clips, but I'm sure that's fixed by
> now).
>>>
>>> I think that's fixed.
>>>
>>>
>>>> 3 - Add audio tracks without affecting playback (Nuendo/SX have to mute
>>>> playback while adding tracks, but that is probably a necessary tradeoff
> of
>>>> full PDC).
>>>
>>> You can do pretty much anything in Logic without stopping playback. I
>>> don't think I've ever added tracks during playback, I'll have to try that.
>>>
>>>
>>>> I wouldn't say Logic is inadequate for audio, just a different approach,
>>>> with its' own strengths and weaknesses like any other DAW. As long as
> I
>>>> have full PDC I would be happy to mix a record on Logic.
>>>
>>> Anyone who remembers Logic from version 5.x on Wi95 or OS9 would
>>> probably be glad to see the improvements made since then. Onward and upward.
>>>
>>> BTW, Logic 7.2 will run on Intel OSX next month, so they say. $50 upgrade.
>>>
>>> Cheers,

>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>> On 1/19/06 3:13 PM, in article 43d00edb@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> I used Logic on PC until moving to Nuendo. I never thought it was
> hard to
>>>>>> learn, but maybe I'm weird that way.
>>>>>> I agree with Lamont - it is probably the best sequencer out there.
> Audio,
>>>>>> not as nice as Nuendo, but certainly
>>>>>> workable. I still have a soft spot for Logic even though I don't use
> it
>>>>>> much.
>>>>>> Did I read right in this thread that it still doesn't have sample
>>>>>> accurate
>>>>>> editing for audio?
>>>>>
>>>>> Hey Dedric, yep you read it but it was wrong...Logic 7.1 does have
>>>>> sample accurate editing.
>>>>>
>>>>> I continue to hear good things about Nuendo. What audio features do
> you
>>>>> think it has that Logic lacks?
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> As far as the new Macs go, I hope they are as fast as comparable PCs,
> and
>>>>>> priced competitively. Perhaps
>>>>>> then both companies would have level competition to force better
>>>>>> operating
>>>>>> systems, hardware, apps, etc..
>>>>>> ...okay, I'm dreaming now...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I can't see moving back to Logic just for the new Apogee hardware,

> but I
>>>>>> like the concept and claims of tight
>>>>>> integration with Logic. I guess Apple really is serious about pro
> audio
>>>>>> (either that or Apogee is hoping they are).
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the
Posted by Jamie K on Sun, 22 Jan 2006 00:23:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah, releasing software before its time is an epidemic. Software QA is
a lost art.

Before upgrading anything, from the OS on up, it pays to check online
reports and see if the update is actually working.

Logic is at 7.1 now and with that and the pro-apps OSX update tweaks
from Apple it has become much more stable. The crashing thing has
stopped happening here. Still has that pesky bug where it sometimes
forgets to play an soft synth - have to restart the project to get it
back if that happens. But otherwise as far as handling tons of tracks,
FX and plugins, it's working better now. I don't use Ultrabeat but I do
sometimes use Sculpture (best to have a G5 for Sculpture).

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

LaMont Davis wrote:
> It seems that they re-tweaked the entire program with this update. When we
> upgraded to Logic 7 along with purchasing dual CPU G5's, Logic 7 was not
> as steady as it's predecessors. Especially, if we used teh "Ultrabeat" plugin
> and Sculpture.
>
> I'm not singling out Emagic, but Steignberg as well as, Motu. These companies
> bring out (SELL) these so -called updates, only to come up short. As a working
> pro, you actually loose productivity when you upgrade. This is a problem
> thu out our industry. Thus, the trust factor starts in. Which made me swear
> off Apple & Logic audio and Steingberg.

>
> Mt question is: How do you loose fuctionality ,sometimes sound quality in
> an app, that a DAW manufacturer makes you pay for "being a guinea pig"??
> This is really austounding of how many people just jump and run to update
> their stable working,$$money making systems to, updating to a bug infested
> "upgrade" revision 1.0??
> Facsinating..
>
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>
>>Thanks for the update - sounds like the difference between Logic and Nuendo
>>is a GUI.
>>
>>One other nice part of Logic I would like to see in Nuendo is window layout
>>handling somewhat independent of Windows. Vegas has a similar approach
>
> and
>
>>dockable windows, in addition to recallable layouts. Just a better feel.
>>
>>I might have to upgrade my PC version to 7, if I add an OSX machine to the
>>growing herd of comps in the studio.
>>
>>Regards,
>>Dedric
>>
>>On 1/20/06 1:13 AM, in article 43d09b71@linux, "Jamie K"
>><Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>
>>>>Hey Jamie,
>>>>
>>>>That makes more sense - I couldn't see how Logic would have made it to
>
> 7
>
>>>>without sample accurate audio.
>>>>
>>>>I can't speak for anything beyond 5.5, so take my comment with a grain
>
> of
>
>>>>salt.
>>>
>>>I'll see if I can bring you up to date. :^)

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Logic may in reality have most every editing feature Nuendo has, but
>>>>to me, audio seemed easier in Nuendo after switching - that could be
>
> nothing
>
>>>>more than subjective psychovisuals, but tools, visuals that contribute
>
> to
>
>>>>how quickly I can analyze and edit an audio track, and at the time, much
>>>>better crossfade editing options (5.5 was a bit limited there). Handling
>>>>audio as events or clips, time warp, etc. are also nice features.
>>>
>>>They added new crossfade options to Logic. Version 6 or 7, I forget
>>>which but I was glad to see it. You can just drag across adjacent
>>>regions and can also edit numerically.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Probably the big missing feature (or so I hear - again, correct if wrong
>>>>here), is plugin delay compensation on busses.
>>>
>>>Added in 7.1: "Full Native Plug-In Delay Compensation
>>>Take advantage of full plug-in delay compensation which now corrects for
>>>latency produced on bus, auxiliary, and output channels in addition to
>>>every other path in the native audio mixer. You'll especially appreciate
>>>this enhancement if you own third party DSP cards like those developed
>>>by Universal Audio and TC Electronics." (From
>>>http://docs.info.apple.com/article.html?artnum=301426)
>>>
>>>I agree that Logic 5.x had limitations but they've been steadily
>>>addressing them.
>>>
>>>Here's an article about version 7 you may find interesting:
>>>
>>>http://www.tweakheadz.com/review_of_logic_pro_7.htm
>>>
>>>Apple's lists of 7 and 7.1 improvements:
>>>http://images.apple.com/logicpro/pdf/LogicPro7_PO.pdf
>>> http://manuals.info.apple.com/en/Improvements_in_Logic_Pro_7 .1.pdf
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>That said, there are some cool aspects to Logic that Nuendo doesn't have:
>>>>1 - more powerful midi (but to be fair, I haven't found anything I couldn't

>>>>do in Nuendo, other than a complement to Logic's environment).
>>>>2 - dynamic processing allocation - not an official feature that I know
>
> of
>
>>>>but one users have been asking for in Nuendo. The beauty here - start
>
> a
>
>>>>song loaded with plugins and it doesn't max out the cpu until it reaches
>
> the
>
>>>>point in the song it has to load that one last plugin - nice. Nuendo
>
> will
>
>>>>sit there and stutter painfully until you can get a stop key through
>
> it's
>
>>>>overloaded brain. The advantage of static (Nuendo) is reverb/delay
>>>>processing - it continues after playback is stopped (used to be a problem
>>>>with Logic, requiring dummy audio clips, but I'm sure that's fixed by
>
> now).
>
>>>I think that's fixed.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>3 - Add audio tracks without affecting playback (Nuendo/SX have to mute
>>>>playback while adding tracks, but that is probably a necessary tradeoff
>
> of
>
>>>>full PDC).
>>>
>>>You can do pretty much anything in Logic without stopping playback. I
>>>don't think I've ever added tracks during playback, I'll have to try that.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>I wouldn't say Logic is inadequate for audio, just a different approach,
>>>>with its' own strengths and weaknesses like any other DAW. As long as
>
> I
>

>>>>have full PDC I would be happy to mix a record on Logic.
>>>
>>>Anyone who remembers Logic from version 5.x on Wi95 or OS9 would
>>>probably be glad to see the improvements made since then. Onward and upward.
>>>
>>>BTW, Logic 7.2 will run on Intel OSX next month, so they say. $50 upgrade.
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>>-Jamie
>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Regards,
>>>>Dedric
>>>>
>>>>On 1/19/06 3:13 PM, in article 43d00edb@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>><Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>I used Logic on PC until moving to Nuendo. I never thought it was
>
> hard to
>
>>>>>>learn, but maybe I'm weird that way.
>>>>>>I agree with Lamont - it is probably the best sequencer out there.
>
> Audio,
>
>>>>>>not as nice as Nuendo, but certainly
>>>>>>workable. I still have a soft spot for Logic even though I don't use
>
> it
>
>>>>>>much.
>>>>>>Did I read right in this thread that it still doesn't have sample accurate
>>>>>>editing for audio?
>>>>>
>>>>>Hey Dedric, yep you read it but it was wrong...Logic 7.1 does have
>>>>>sample accurate editing.
>>>>>
>>>>>I continue to hear good things about Nuendo. What audio features do
>
> you

>
>>>>>think it has that Logic lacks?
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>As far as the new Macs go, I hope they are as fast as comparable PCs,
>
> and
>
>>>>>>priced competitively. Perhaps
>>>>>>then both companies would have level competition to force better operating
>>>>>>systems, hardware, apps, etc..
>>>>>>...okay, I'm dreaming now...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I can't see moving back to Logic just for the new Apogee hardware,
>
> but I
>
>>>>>>like the concept and claims of tight
>>>>>>integration with Logic. I guess Apple really is serious about pro
>
> audio
>
>>>>>>(either that or Apogee is hoping they are).
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Regards,
>>>>>>Dedric
>>>>
>>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the
Posted by Michele Hobbs on Sun, 22 Jan 2006 05:26:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You can reset the audio interface in OSX too. Nice for changing buffer settings without re-starting the program.

Speaking of the audio instrument problem,other thing I've tried is to just remove the plug-in from the instrument object and put it back again. Sometimes it works, sometimes not.

-Michele Hobbs

LaMont wrote:
> Hey Jamie,
> Strange, but using a vst on Logic, all yu have to do is go into the audio
> settings , un check the vst audio, then re-check the box which in-turns,
> relauches or resets the audio interface.
> Strange, but it works..That's why I keep using Logic 5.3 on windows. You
> are right, on the G5-OSx,boom..Re-start the app..
>
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>>Yeah, releasing software before its time is an epidemic. Software QA is
>
>
>>a lost art.
>>
>>Before upgrading anything, from the OS on up, it pays to check online
>>reports and see if the update is actually working.
>>
>>Logic is at 7.1 now and with that and the pro-apps OSX update tweaks
>
>>from Apple it has become much more stable. The crashing thing has
>
>>stopped happening here. Still has that pesky bug where it sometimes
>>forgets to play an soft synth - have to restart the project to get it
>>back if that happens. But otherwise as far as handling tons of tracks,
>>FX and plugins, it's working better now. I don't use Ultrabeat but I do
>
>
>>sometimes use Sculpture (best to have a G5 for Sculpture).
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Namm news!!!! Hot Off the Press ..Another Piece to the
Posted by LaMont on Sun, 22 Jan 2006 05:55:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Jamie,
Strange, but using a vst on Logic, all yu have to do is go into the audio
settings , un check the vst audio, then re-check the box which in-turns,
relauches or resets the audio interface.
Strange, but it works..That's why I keep using Logic 5.3 on windows. You

are right, on the G5-OSx,boom..Re-start the app..

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>Yeah, releasing software before its time is an epidemic. Software QA is

>a lost art.
>
>Before upgrading anything, from the OS on up, it pays to check online
>reports and see if the update is actually working.
>
>Logic is at 7.1 now and with that and the pro-apps OSX update tweaks
>from Apple it has become much more stable. The crashing thing has
>stopped happening here. Still has that pesky bug where it sometimes
>forgets to play an soft synth - have to restart the project to get it
>back if that happens. But otherwise as far as handling tons of tracks,
>FX and plugins, it's working better now. I don't use Ultrabeat but I do

>sometimes use Sculpture (best to have a G5 for Sculpture).
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>LaMont Davis wrote:
>> It seems that they re-tweaked the entire program with this update. When
we
>> upgraded to Logic 7 along with purchasing dual CPU G5's, Logic 7 was not
>> as steady as it's predecessors. Especially, if we used teh "Ultrabeat"
plugin
>> and Sculpture.
>>
>> I'm not singling out Emagic, but Steignberg as well as, Motu. These companies
>> bring out (SELL) these so -called updates, only to come up short. As a
working
>> pro, you actually loose productivity when you upgrade. This is a problem
>> thu out our industry. Thus, the trust factor starts in. Which made me
swear
>> off Apple & Logic audio and Steingberg.
>>
>> Mt question is: How do you loose fuctionality ,sometimes sound quality
in
>> an app, that a DAW manufacturer makes you pay for "being a guinea pig"??
>> This is really austounding of how many people just jump and run to update
>> their stable working,$$money making systems to, updating to a bug infested
>> "upgrade" revision 1.0??

>> Facsinating..
>>
>>
>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>
>>>Thanks for the update - sounds like the difference between Logic and Nuendo
>>>is a GUI.
>>>
>>>One other nice part of Logic I would like to see in Nuendo is window layout
>>>handling somewhat independent of Windows. Vegas has a similar approach
>>
>> and
>>
>>>dockable windows, in addition to recallable layouts. Just a better feel.
>>>
>>>I might have to upgrade my PC version to 7, if I add an OSX machine to
the
>>>growing herd of comps in the studio.
>>>
>>>Regards,
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>>On 1/20/06 1:13 AM, in article 43d09b71@linux, "Jamie K"
>>><Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Hey Jamie,
>>>>>
>>>>>That makes more sense - I couldn't see how Logic would have made it
to
>>
>> 7
>>
>>>>>without sample accurate audio.
>>>>>
>>>>>I can't speak for anything beyond 5.5, so take my comment with a grain
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>>salt.
>>>>
>>>>I'll see if I can bring you up to date. :^)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Logic may in reality have most every editing feature Nuendo has, but

>>>>>to me, audio seemed easier in Nuendo after switching - that could be
>>
>> nothing
>>
>>>>>more than subjective psychovisuals, but tools, visuals that contribute
>>
>> to
>>
>>>>>how quickly I can analyze and edit an audio track, and at the time,
much
>>>>>better crossfade editing options (5.5 was a bit limited there). Handling
>>>>>audio as events or clips, time warp, etc. are also nice features.
>>>>
>>>>They added new crossfade options to Logic. Version 6 or 7, I forget
>>>>which but I was glad to see it. You can just drag across adjacent
>>>>regions and can also edit numerically.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Probably the big missing feature (or so I hear - again, correct if wrong
>>>>>here), is plugin delay compensation on busses.
>>>>
>>>>Added in 7.1: "Full Native Plug-In Delay Compensation
>>>>Take advantage of full plug-in delay compensation which now corrects
for
>>>>latency produced on bus, auxiliary, and output channels in addition to
>>>>every other path in the native audio mixer. You'll especially appreciate
>>>>this enhancement if you own third party DSP cards like those developed
>>>>by Universal Audio and TC Electronics." (From
>>>>http://docs.info.apple.com/article.html?artnum=301426)
>>>>
>>>>I agree that Logic 5.x had limitations but they've been steadily
>>>>addressing them.
>>>>
>>>>Here's an article about version 7 you may find interesting:
>>>>
>>>>http://www.tweakheadz.com/review_of_logic_pro_7.htm
>>>>
>>>>Apple's lists of 7 and 7.1 improvements:
>>>>http://images.apple.com/logicpro/pdf/LogicPro7_PO.pdf
>>>> http://manuals.info.apple.com/en/Improvements_in_Logic_Pro_7 .1.pdf
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>That said, there are some cool aspects to Logic that Nuendo doesn't
have:
>>>>>1 - more powerful midi (but to be fair, I haven't found anything I couldn't
>>>>>do in Nuendo, other than a complement to Logic's environment).

>>>>>2 - dynamic processing allocation - not an official feature that I know
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>>but one users have been asking for in Nuendo. The beauty here - start
>>
>> a
>>
>>>>>song loaded with plugins and it doesn't max out the cpu until it reaches
>>
>> the
>>
>>>>>point in the song it has to load that one last plugin - nice. Nuendo
>>
>> will
>>
>>>>>sit there and stutter painfully until you can get a stop key through
>>
>> it's
>>
>>>>>overloaded brain. The advantage of static (Nuendo) is reverb/delay
>>>>>processing - it continues after playback is stopped (used to be a problem
>>>>>with Logic, requiring dummy audio clips, but I'm sure that's fixed by
>>
>> now).
>>
>>>>I think that's fixed.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>3 - Add audio tracks without affecting playback (Nuendo/SX have to mute
>>>>>playback while adding tracks, but that is probably a necessary tradeoff
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>>full PDC).
>>>>
>>>>You can do pretty much anything in Logic without stopping playback. I
>>>>don't think I've ever added tracks during playback, I'll have to try
that.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I wouldn't say Logic is inadequate for audio, just a different approach,
>>>>>with its' own strengths and weaknesses like any other DAW. As long
as
>>
>> I

>>
>>>>>have full PDC I would be happy to mix a record on Logic.
>>>>
>>>>Anyone who remembers Logic from version 5.x on Wi95 or OS9 would
>>>>probably be glad to see the improvements made since then. Onward and
upward.
>>>>
>>>>BTW, Logic 7.2 will run on Intel OSX next month, so they say. $50 upgrade.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>>-Jamie
>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Regards,
>>>>>Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>>On 1/19/06 3:13 PM, in article 43d00edb@linux, "Jamie K"
>>>>><Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I used Logic on PC until moving to Nuendo. I never thought it was
>>
>> hard to
>>
>>>>>>>learn, but maybe I'm weird that way.
>>>>>>>I agree with Lamont - it is probably the best sequencer out there.
>>
>> Audio,
>>
>>>>>>>not as nice as Nuendo, but certainly
>>>>>>>workable. I still have a soft spot for Logic even though I don't
use
>>
>> it
>>
>>>>>>>much.
>>>>>>>Did I read right in this thread that it still doesn't have sample
accurate
>>>>>>>editing for audio?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Hey Dedric, yep you read it but it was wrong...Logic 7.1 does have
>>>>>>sample accurate editing.

>>>>>>
>>>>>>I continue to hear good things about Nuendo. What audio features do
>>
>> you
>>
>>>>>>think it has that Logic lacks?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>As far as the new Macs go, I hope they are as fast as comparable PCs,
>>
>> and
>>
>>>>>>>priced competitively. Perhaps
>>>>>>>then both companies would have level competition to force better operating
>>>>>>>systems, hardware, apps, etc..
>>>>>>>...okay, I'm dreaming now...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I can't see moving back to Logic just for the new Apogee hardware,
>>
>> but I
>>
>>>>>>>like the concept and claims of tight
>>>>>>>integration with Logic. I guess Apple really is serious about pro
>>
>> audio
>>
>>>>>>>(either that or Apogee is hoping they are).
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Regards,
>>>>>>>Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>