Subject: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Don Nafe on Fri, 15 Dec 2006 15:55:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Cheap but good (as if)

Suggestions

Don

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Don Nafe on Fri, 15 Dec 2006 16:48:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for the suggestions...will check them out ASAP

Don

"Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4582c874$1@linux...
>
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>Cheap but good (as if)
>
> Standalone de-esser: Spitfish from digitalfishphones... cheap
> (= FREE!) and works great.
>
> Cheap de-esser: Voxengo's Voxformer Fifty-nine bucks gets you a
> KILLER de-esser... But wait! There's More! Plus you get
> dynamics, saturation controls, gating... this thing RAWKS!
> Hell, I like it so much that if you hate it ***I'LL*** refund
> your money! lol (ok, only kidding, but download the demo &
> you'll see what I mean).
>
> http://www.voxengo.com/product/voxformer/
>
> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by John [1] on Fri, 15 Dec 2006 17:04:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&lr=&q=spitfish+vs t&btnG=Search

spitfish

their site appears down at the moment but i'm sure someone can help you out
or I can later on today.

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>Cheap but good (as if)
>
>Suggestions
>
>Don
>
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by neil[1] on Fri, 15 Dec 2006 17:08:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>Cheap but good (as if)

Standalone de-esser: Spitfish from digitalfishphones... cheap
(= FREE!) and works great.

Cheap de-esser: Voxengo's Voxformer Fifty-nine bucks gets you a
KILLER de-esser... But wait! There's More! Plus you get
dynamics, saturation controls, gating... this thing RAWKS!
Hell, I like it so much that if you hate it ***I'LL*** refund
your money! lol (ok, only kidding, but download the demo &
you'll see what I mean).

http://www.voxengo.com/product/voxformer/

Neil

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by John [1] on Fri, 15 Dec 2006 17:11:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Do I get the knife set that cuts cans? We eat a lot of cans around here.
:-)

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

>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>Cheap but good (as if)
>
>Standalone de-esser: Spitfish from digitalfishphones... cheap
>(= FREE!) and works great.
>
>Cheap de-esser: Voxengo's Voxformer Fifty-nine bucks gets you a
>KILLER de-esser... But wait! There's More! Plus you get
>dynamics, saturation controls, gating... this thing RAWKS!
>Hell, I like it so much that if you hate it ***I'LL*** refund
>your money! lol (ok, only kidding, but download the demo &
>you'll see what I mean).
>
>http://www.voxengo.com/product/voxformer/
>
>Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by duncan on Fri, 15 Dec 2006 17:35:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I like the Dave Brown stuff -- a bargain at $39...

http://www.db-audioware.com/

-- good luck -- chas.

On Fri, 15 Dec 2006 10:55:07 -0500, "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>Cheap but good (as if)
>
>Suggestions
>
>Don
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by DJ on Fri, 15 Dec 2006 23:57:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Tha Antares AVOX bundle has the best software plugin de-esser I've ever
used.

Deej

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:4582c2cf@linux...
> Cheap but good (as if)
>
> Suggestions
>
> Don
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by DJ on Fri, 15 Dec 2006 23:58:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Me too. Good stuff that.

;o)
|
"Chas. Duncan" <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote in message
news:b1n5o21n2l6agav8rau58v8ncsf88c7hr8@4ax.com...
>I like the Dave Brown stuff -- a bargain at $39...
>
> http://www.db-audioware.com/
>
> -- good luck -- chas.
>
> On Fri, 15 Dec 2006 10:55:07 -0500, "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>
>>Cheap but good (as if)
>>
>>Suggestions
>>
>>Don
>>
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by DJ on Sat, 16 Dec 2006 00:10:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Actually, it's called sybil and it is available as a separate plugin.
http://www.mtlc.net/products/4425/Antares+SYBIL+Variable+Fre quency+De-Esser/
Deej

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:458333e9$1@linux...

> Tha Antares AVOX bundle has the best software plugin de-esser I've ever
> used.
>
> Deej
>
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:4582c2cf@linux...
>> Cheap but good (as if)
>>
>> Suggestions
>>
>> Don
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Rod Lincoln on Sat, 16 Dec 2006 00:55:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Better than the Dave Brown???
Rod
"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>Tha Antares AVOX bundle has the best software plugin de-esser I've ever

>used.
>
>Deej
>
>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:4582c2cf@linux...
>> Cheap but good (as if)
>>
>> Suggestions
>>
>> Don
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Neil on Sat, 16 Dec 2006 01:01:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Better than the one in Voxformer???

Neil

"Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:
>
>Better than the Dave Brown???
>Rod
>"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>>Tha Antares AVOX bundle has the best software plugin de-esser I've ever
>
>>used.
>>
>>Deej
>>
>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:4582c2cf@linux...
>>> Cheap but good (as if)
>>>
>>> Suggestions
>>>
>>> Don
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Nil on Sat, 16 Dec 2006 01:06:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>Thanks for the suggestions...will check them out ASAP
>
>Don

http://www.voxengo.com/files/VoxengoVoxformer_17_WinVST_setu p.exe

http://www.voxengo.com/files/VoxengoVoxformer_17_WinVST_setu p.exe

http://www.voxengo.com/files/VoxengoVoxformer_17_WinVST_setu p.exe
http://www.voxengo.com/files/VoxengoVoxformer_17_WinVST_setu p.exe

!!!

lol

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in

Posted by DJ on Sat, 16 Dec 2006 04:37:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Haven't tried the voxformer. the Dave Brown is much more intuitive with the graphic display, but I can dial in a serious de-ess with Sybil that is the equivalent to my SPL hardware de-esser. The SPL is the best I've ever used, period. Without it I would die.
http://www.soundperformancelab.com/DeEsser/in_short.html

I've heard that the Drawmer unit is considered a "holy grail" item by some engineers but I've never used one.

The deesser on my focusrite RED7 is pretty good, but nothing to compare to the SPL, or Sybil, for that matter.....but after Neil's experience with Pulsar, I'm gonna have to add an emphatic "IMHO" and also a big, fat "YMMV" to everything I recommend from now on..

;o)

"Neil" <IUI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4583376a$1@linux...
>
> Better than the one in Voxformer???
>
> Neil
>
> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:
>>
>>Better than the Dave Brown???
>>Rod
>>"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>>>Tha Antares AVOX bundle has the best software plugin de-esser I've ever
>>
>>>used.
>>>
>>>Deej
>>>
>>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:4582c2cf@linux...
>>>> Cheap but good (as if)
>>>>
>>>> Suggestions
>>>>
>>>> Don
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Neil on Sat, 16 Dec 2006 17:43:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

>but after Neil's experience with Pulsar, I'm gonna have to add
>an emphatic "IMHO" and also a big, fat "YMMV" to everything I
>recommend from now on..

After my experience with Pulsar, I'm tempted to sell everything except my guitars & Fantom & simply pay someone else to record me when I feel like recording my stuff, and just forget all about recording any other people. I'm serious - I'm totally in a quandary as to what to do right now... I am SO sick & tired of trying this & trying that & still NEVER being able to get exactly what I want final mix-wise. "Close" isn't cutting it for me anymore.

I really don't know where to go at this point, honestly. PTHD? Simple one-shot solution... can't really justify the expense, though. Analog Mixer? Same thing as PTHD with regard to the expense for a good one & I don't see the benefit of going "downscale" there. Digital Mixer? Dunno if that'd do it - I'd have to hear it, try it, etc. Passive summing mixer? I dunno how much of that is really snake-oil: I'd have to buy-it-try-it, a/b mixes, etc, etc, sell it if I hate it, try something else, shitcan it if I hate it.... and I'm kinda tired of the whole cycle that I've gotten into lately of tweak, remix, find a workaround, tweak, remix, try something else, tweak/remix, ad nauseum.

I'm NOT being productive, is the point.

So, I have no fucking clue as to where to go next with this, or if there's some affordable solution out there somewhere that'll get me what I want, which is simply a streamlined, killer-sounding, one-box solution. I'm tending to think "not".

Neil

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Jamie K on Sat, 16 Dec 2006 20:06:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Neil,

Dunno if this will help, but your quandary has me thinking out loud (if these comments don't fit your situation feel free to ignore them):

What if you start at the end and work backwards?

Instead of trying this or that voodoo piece of gear, hearing what it does, and ditching it if it doesn't do what you want...

Start with what you want. Hear it in your head. Then analyze what it is about your final desired sound that equals "killer" for you.

Is it clean, non-distorted crispness? Is it a type of distortion? Is it an eq curve, certain frequencies you need to hear? Is it combinations of instruments that don't step on each other? Is it stereo wideness?

Make a list of priorities.

Now start thinking about gear. What is the simplest signal path to achieve each of your top 5 priorities?

Strip down your system to the simplest signal path you can, with monitors you can trust and a room that isn't mucking things up (if your monitors and room are sabotaging you, nothing will work).

Record something very simple. For example, just your voice, or just your guitar. Can you make just that one track sound like you envision, meeting your top 5 priorities?

If not, start working on your signal path, think about careful and moderate eq or fx (little or none), and if necessary swap gear, until you can. When you get there, keep track of what worked. Was it EQ? Was it a certain room verb? Was it a touch of compression? Was it no FX?

Then add another track. Can you make a "killer" two track mix?

How about three?

Slowly build up a mix while keeping your signal paths as simple as possible, and keeping variables to a minimum. Keep track of the variables that bring you into the zone. Keep track of the ones that don't, so you can avoid mucking up the mix with approaches that suck energy away.

I suspect that most DAW systems, native and DSP, have enough range to deliver a decent mix. So, while the search for gear is important, at some point it's less about the gear and more about finding your sound with the gear you have.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Neil wrote:
> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>
>> but after Neil's experience with Pulsar, I'm gonna have to add
>> an emphatic "IMHO" and also a big, fat "YMMV" to everything I
>> recommend from now on..
>
> After my experience with Pulsar, I'm tempted to sell everything
> except my guitars & Fantom & simply pay someone else to record
> me when I feel like recording my stuff, and just forget all
> about recording any other people. I'm serious - I'm totally in
> a quandary as to what to do right now... I am SO sick &
> tired of trying this & trying that & still NEVER being able to
> get exactly what I want final mix-wise. "Close" isn't cutting
> it for me anymore.
>
> I really don't know where to go at this point, honestly.
> PTHD? Simple one-shot solution... can't really justify the
> expense, though. Analog Mixer? Same thing as PTHD with regard
> to the expense for a good one & I don't see the benefit of
> going "downscale" there. Digital Mixer? Dunno if that'd do it -
> I'd have to hear it, try it, etc. Passive summing mixer?
> I dunno how much of that is really snake-oil: I'd have to buy-
> it-try-it, a/b mixes, etc, etc, sell it if I hate it, try
> something else, shitcan it if I hate it.... and I'm kinda tired
> of the whole cycle that I've gotten into lately of tweak,
> remix, find a workaround, tweak, remix, try something else,
> tweak/remix, ad nauseum.
>
> I'm NOT being productive, is the point.
>
> So, I have no fucking clue as to where to go next with this, or
> if there's some affordable solution out there somewhere that'll
> get me what I want, which is simply a streamlined, killer-
> sounding, one-box solution. I'm tending to think "not".
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by "Neil" OIUO on Sun, 17 Dec 2006 00:43:44 GMT

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>What if you start at the end and work backwards?

Then that means I have to start each mix with a preconceived notion, instead of letting the song "mix itself", as it were.... IOW, to me a song should just come together - not necessarily simply/easily, but the song should tell you which direction to go in, not the other way around.

>Instead of trying this or that voodoo piece of gear, hearing
>what it does, and ditching it if it doesn't do what you want...

I haven't exactly done that, though... I've tried things that SHOULD get me closer to where I want to be, based on what I've heard other people say about them.

>Start with what you want. Hear it in your head. Then analyze
>what it is about your final desired sound that equals "killer"
>for you. Is it clean, non-distorted crispness? Is it a type of distortion? Is it an eq curve, certain frequencies you need to hear? Is it combinations of instruments that don't step on each other? Is it stereo wideness?

It's hard to say exactly - it's almost one of those: "I'll know it when I hear it" kinda things... you know where you dial something in & just jump out of your chair & say "YEAH! THAT'S IT RIGHT THERE!" I never have those moments anymore... it's always: "eh, that's not too bad" or "That's pretty close." or something like that.

Ultimately, though, what I'm short of mix-wise is a combination of clarity/power/size. And by "power", I don't mean RMS; by "size" I don't mean depth or width alone, but a combination of both. In Paris, I could get the power & size, but not the clarity; in Cubase I can get the clarity, but I'm coming up short on the power & size. Summing in Paris helped, but then I lose some clarity & transparency. Running stems out of Cubase, then reimporting into a new project to get the final 2-mix helps too... that way you get a bit more well-defined soundstage & get to keep the clarity, but this is just another workaround, really... I still would like to be able to hear the FINAL 2-track product as I'm mixing, without another step in between. I was hoping Pulsar could keep me in the digital domain all the way through the process, but it can't at my chosen samplerate. Convert everything to 96k then use Pulsar? Nope, this puts my PC over the top - now I'd be looking at more

money for another upgrade just to see if the experiment would work. Convert everything to 44.1? Maybe I should... maybe my hi-rez quest is nothing more than tilting at windmills.

>Record something very simple. For example, just your voice, or
>just your guitar. Can you make just that one track sound like
>you envision

Yes, one track is fine, two is fine, a few is fine, a lot is even fine... it's the entire mix that I'm not able to get where I want... maybe it's VST EFX vs hardware, maybe it's ITB mixing of any kind vs a console, maybe I really like phasey/smeary analog EQ & just don't know it. Point is, at this stage, I don't KNOW what would get me there! If I did, I'd implement that & be done with dicking around.

I appreciate your input, Jamie... it's just one of those things where I'm 98%-99% there, but that last 1 or 2 percent are the most important ones - like the keystone at the top of an arch... it's only one stone, but without it, all the rest collapse.

Neil

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Neil on Sun, 17 Dec 2006 01:15:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Neil" OIUOIU!OIU.com wrote:
>Convert everything to 96k then use Pulsar?

Forgot to mention: I also don't like the math on this option, either... converting from 88.2k to 96k is like asking the machine: "Please fuck up every 11th sample on each & every one of these pristine, hi-rez tracks I recorded.".

Neil

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by DJ on Sun, 17 Dec 2006 04:47:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Neil" <IUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45842218$1@linux...
>
> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>

>>but after Neil's experience with Pulsar, I'm gonna have to add
>>an emphatic "IMHO" and also a big, fat "YMMV" to everything I
>>recommend from now on..
>
> After my experience with Pulsar, I'm tempted to sell everything
> except my guitars & Fantom & simply pay someone else to record
> me when I feel like recording my stuff, and just forget all
> about recording any other people. I'm serious - I'm totally in
> a quandary as to what to do right now... I am SO sick &
> tired of trying this & trying that & still NEVER being able to
> get exactly what I want final mix-wise. "Close" isn't cutting
> it for me anymore.
>
> I really don't know where to go at this point, honestly.
> PTHD? Simple one-shot solution... can't really justify the
> expense, though. Analog Mixer? Same thing as PTHD with regard
> to the expense for a good one & I don't see the benefit of
> going "downscale" there. Digital Mixer? Dunno if that'd do it -
> I'd have to hear it, try it, etc. Passive summing mixer?
> I dunno how much of that is really snake-oil: I'd have to buy-
> it-try-it, a/b mixes, etc, etc, sell it if I hate it, try
> something else, shitcan it if I hate it.... and I'm kinda tired
> of the whole cycle that I've gotten into lately of tweak,
> remix, find a workaround, tweak, remix, try something else,
> tweak/remix, ad nauseum.
>
> I'm NOT being productive, is the point.
>
> So, I have no fucking clue as to where to go next with this, or
> if there's some affordable solution out there somewhere that'll
> get me what I want, which is simply a streamlined, killer-
> sounding, one-box solution. I'm tending to think "not".
>
> Neil

Neil,

I'm very happy with the sonic footprintof my DAW. The hoops I jump through are ridiculous and I doubt that at the end of the day, anyone but me would GAF about the sublety of the differences. There are lots of disadvantages to a multi modular system. I've got so many different things interfacing digitally that if something starts to act up, the probabality of me finding it within less than an hour or two are practically nil. I know the system well though and can pretty much troubleshoot it efficiently, but there are lots of potential Gremlins. It takes me about 10 minutes to boot from a dead standstill and get my templates loaded and ready to import files to mix. That's a little slow, but tolerable.....but if something goes wrong, then it's 10 more minutes.etc. .....that's when I start going postal.

Tonight I started having some stability problems with a project. I got kinda' fatigued and sloppy and made some "not so optimal" edits in Cubase. I think this may have caused some problems when inserting UAD-1 plugins.....I think..... then again, it might be heat. I can walk into my machine room and the temperature is 15 -20 degrees above room temp with the exhaust fans blowing out of 3 x Magmas with 3 x Pulsars, 4 x UAD-1's and 4 x EDS X cards. I had three glitches within about 5 minutes so and these cards are working hard so it could be that after 7 hours, they need a rest. I know I do so we'll see if things behave normally in the morning when the Magma's are cooled down and I am seeing straight.

Cheers,

Deej
..

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Graham Duncan on Sun, 17 Dec 2006 19:36:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neil,

Have you blind tested your 88.2 files vs. 44.1 on your gear? Have you listened to Voxengo's r8brain (or pro)?

Also, I think you should look up a producer or engineer you think is the best in your genre and pick their brains, perhaps even hire them to track/mix a few tunes. You'll probably learn what you want in that scenario. Or, it's possible that they won't get you closer either, in which case your time searching for what works for you won't be wasted in any sense (and I don't think it's wasted in any case). But I think you're close and maybe just need a little time away to clear the air.

Good luck!

Graham

"Neil" <IUOI@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>"Neil" OIUOIU!OIU.com wrote:
>>Convert everything to 96k then use Pulsar?
>
>Forgot to mention: I also don't like the math on this option,
>either... converting from 88.2k to 96k is like asking the
>machine: "Please fuck up every 11th sample on each & every one
>of these pristine, hi-rez tracks I recorded.".

>
>Neil

Subject: Re: looking for De-esser plug in
Posted by Neil on Mon, 18 Dec 2006 00:05:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Graham Duncan" <graham@grahamduncan.com> wrote:
>
>Neil,
>
>Have you blind tested your 88.2 files vs. 44.1 on your gear?

Not in the context of individual tracks within an entire song - that would involve retracking an entire piece track by track... something I'm not interested in doing... YET! Simply converting 88.2k tracks to 44.1 wouldn't be a fair test becasue one would have the extra step of conversion & the other one wouldn't. I have, however, a/b'd 44.1k mixes to 88.2k mixes of the same song & yes, I can hear a difference there if that's what you meant.

>Have you listened to Voxengo's r8brain (or pro)?

Yep, I have r8Brain... I think it's a VERY good samplerate convertor. Don't have the "pro" version, though.

>Also, I think you should look up a producer or engineer you
>think is the best in your genre and pick their brains, perhaps
>even hire them to track/mix a few tunes.

Not a bad idea, but WHO? Maybe it's not the gear, maybe it's the operator (me).

Neil
