Subject: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by Neil on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 01:49:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Project Card and Sync Plate (very important - can't do 88.2k
without it) arrived today - will post new summing comparison
clips ASAP... sometime over the weekend if all goes well.

Neil

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by Neil on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 05:25:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hmmm, it installed OK, first time, no problem.... nice, really.
But its not syncing to the word clock.

Hmmmm...

Neil

"Neil" <IUIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>Project Card and Sync Plate (very important - can't do 88.2k
>without it) arrived today - will post new summing comparison
>clips ASAP... sometime over the weekend if all goes well.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by John [1] on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 11:50:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's because you need 8 of these word clock microphones at $14,000 each.
hehe

http://www.jacksmusicstore.com/catalog/pro-audio/microphones
/neumann/microphones/pro-mic-nmn-mic-h~solution-D-stereo

"Neil" <OUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>Hmmm, it installed OK, first time, no problem.... nice, really.

>But its not syncing to the word clock.
>
>Hmmmm...
>
>Neil
>
>
>"Neil" <IUIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>
>>Project Card and Sync Plate (very important - can't do 88.2k
>>without it) arrived today - will post new summing comparison
>>clips ASAP... sometime over the weekend if all goes well.
>>
>>Neil
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by Nei on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 17:28:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

LOL! Yeah, that'd be about my luck... I forgot to read the part
where it says: "NOTE: Pulsar cards will ONLY sync to the word
clock output of the $14,000 Neumann didgital mics"  :)

But man, I cannot get this thing to sync to 88.2k no matter what
I try - I know it won't do that samplerate as a Master, but now
I'm thinking it won't even slave to it under any circumstances.

Neil

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>
>That's because you need 8 of these word clock microphones at $14,000 each.
> hehe

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by excelav on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 17:38:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>
>That's because you need 8 of these word clock microphones at $14,000 each.
> hehe
>
> http://www.jacksmusicstore.com/catalog/pro-audio/microphones

/neumann/microphones/pro-mic-nmn-mic-h~solution-D-stereo
>
>

Now you did it!  Deej is going to see this and he's going to think he'll die if he doesn't get one.

James

>
>"Neil" <OUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hmmm, it installed OK, first time, no problem.... nice, really.
>>But its not syncing to the word clock.
>>
>>Hmmmm...
>>
>>Neil
>>
>>
>>"Neil" <IUIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Project Card and Sync Plate (very important - can't do 88.2k
>>>without it) arrived today - will post new summing comparison
>>>clips ASAP... sometime over the weekend if all goes well.
>>>
>>>Neil
>>
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by John [1] on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 17:56:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Is there a Pulsar support forum or phone support ?

"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>LOL! Yeah, that'd be about my luck... I forgot to read the part
>where it says: "NOTE: Pulsar cards will ONLY sync to the word
>clock output of the $14,000 Neumann didgital mics"  :)
>
>But man, I cannot get this thing to sync to 88.2k no matter what
>I try - I know it won't do that samplerate as a Master, but now
>I'm thinking it won't even slave to it under any circumstances.
>
>Neil

>
>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>>
>>That's because you need 8 of these word clock microphones at $14,000 each.
>> hehe
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by DJ on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 19:21:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neil,

I'm assuming that you have the following scenario in place:

75ohm BNC cable from clock to sync plate input (the one on top-the bottom on is the output)

In the routing window the sync plate source is connected to the ASIO destingation clock input?

I've got my clock set to 88.2 and Pulsar is showing 96kHz, but it should play back at 88.2kHz but Pulsar is definitely slaved and though it may show 96k, there's no way it could bplay back at any other sample rate than 88.2 if is it slaved.

Cubase SX shows the sample rate to be 96k also but that could be because it is slaved to the Pulsar ASIO and can only exhibit what Pulsar is capable of exhibiting. I don't have any 88.2 audio files here to test.

Is your audio pitched higher than it should be?? I can't believe we didn't think to test this on my rig before you went to all this trouble.

;oP

"Neil" <OIUOI@OIU.com> wrote in message news:457ae44b$1@linux...
>
> LOL! Yeah, that'd be about my luck... I forgot to read the part
> where it says: "NOTE: Pulsar cards will ONLY sync to the word
> clock output of the $14,000 Neumann didgital mics"  :)
>
> But man, I cannot get this thing to sync to 88.2k no matter what
> I try - I know it won't do that samplerate as a Master, but now
> I'm thinking it won't even slave to it under any circumstances.
>

> Neil
>
> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>>
>>That's because you need 8 of these word clock microphones at $14,000 each.
>> hehe
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by Aaron Allen on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 20:22:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:457b0a14@linux...
> Neil,
>
> I'm assuming that you have the following scenario in place:
>
> 75ohm BNC cable from clock to sync plate input (the one on top-the bottom
> on is the output)
>
> In the routing window the sync plate source is connected to the ASIO
> destingation clock input?
>
> I've got my clock set to 88.2 and Pulsar is showing 96kHz, but it should
> play back at 88.2kHz but Pulsar is definitely slaved and though it may
> show 96k, there's no way it could bplay back at any other sample rate than
> 88.2 if is it slaved.
>

Ah, the ole' MEC is at 48k but not really slave LED errata.
Neil should feel right at home with this. :)

> Cubase SX shows the sample rate to be 96k also but that could be because
> it is slaved to the Pulsar ASIO and can only exhibit what Pulsar is
> capable of exhibiting. I don't have any 88.2 audio files here to test.

r8brain: make your own from existing files ?
http://www.voxengo.com/product/r8brain/

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by DJ on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 20:26:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's what I was thinking.

;o)

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
news:457b1866@linux...
>
> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:457b0a14@linux...
>> Neil,
>>
>> I'm assuming that you have the following scenario in place:
>>
>> 75ohm BNC cable from clock to sync plate input (the one on top-the bottom
>> on is the output)
>>
>> In the routing window the sync plate source is connected to the ASIO
>> destingation clock input?
>>
>> I've got my clock set to 88.2 and Pulsar is showing 96kHz, but it should
>> play back at 88.2kHz but Pulsar is definitely slaved and though it may
>> show 96k, there's no way it could bplay back at any other sample rate
>> than 88.2 if is it slaved.
>>
>
> Ah, the ole' MEC is at 48k but not really slave LED errata.
> Neil should feel right at home with this. :)
>
>
>> Cubase SX shows the sample rate to be 96k also but that could be because
>> it is slaved to the Pulsar ASIO and can only exhibit what Pulsar is
>> capable of exhibiting. I don't have any 88.2 audio files here to test.
>
> r8brain: make your own from existing files ?
> http://www.voxengo.com/product/r8brain/
>
>
>
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by DJ on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 20:42:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm looking for test tones of the same frequency (or sweep) that were
recorded at 88.2k and 96k. Can't find any. Maybe they have these at
Petsmart?

;o)

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
news:457b1866@linux...
>
> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote in message news:457b0a14@linux...
>> Neil,
>>
>> I'm assuming that you have the following scenario in place:
>>
>> 75ohm BNC cable from clock to sync plate input (the one on top-the bottom
>> on is the output)
>>
>> In the routing window the sync plate source is connected to the ASIO
>> destingation clock input?
>>
>> I've got my clock set to 88.2 and Pulsar is showing 96kHz, but it should
>> play back at 88.2kHz but Pulsar is definitely slaved and though it may
>> show 96k, there's no way it could bplay back at any other sample rate
>> than 88.2 if is it slaved.
>>
>
> Ah, the ole' MEC is at 48k but not really slave LED errata.
> Neil should feel right at home with this. :)
>
>
>> Cubase SX shows the sample rate to be 96k also but that could be because
>> it is slaved to the Pulsar ASIO and can only exhibit what Pulsar is
>> capable of exhibiting. I don't have any 88.2 audio files here to test.
>
> r8brain: make your own from existing files ?
> http://www.voxengo.com/product/r8brain/
>
>
>
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by Nil on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 21:37:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>I'm assuming that you have the following scenario in place:
>75ohm BNC cable from clock to sync plate input (the one on top-
>the bottom on is the output)

Yep. I RTFM & got it right the first time  LOL

>In the routing window the sync plate source is connected to
>the ASIO destingation clock input?

I tried it with this connected & without - neither way makes any
difference.

>I've got my clock set to 88.2 and Pulsar is showing 96kHz, but it should

>play back at 88.2kHz but Pulsar is definitely slaved and though it may show

>96k, there's no way it could bplay back at any other sample rate than 88.2

>if is it slaved.

But is it REALLY slaved? Does the "set sample rate" window show
a red light under the word "connected" at 88.2k? Because mine
will sync & red-light-lock to 44.1, 48, and 96k, but not 88.2k.

Neil

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by Aaron Allen on Sat, 09 Dec 2006 22:03:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

might be a dumb question, but do you need to/have you tried to terminate the
word clock?

AA

"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:457b1e6e$1@linux...
>
> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:
>>I'm assuming that you have the following scenario in place:
>>75ohm BNC cable from clock to sync plate input (the one on top-
>>the bottom on is the output)
>
> Yep. I RTFM & got it right the first time  LOL
>
>
>>In the routing window the sync plate source is connected to
>>the ASIO destingation clock input?
>
> I tried it with this connected & without - neither way makes any
> difference.
>

>>I've got my clock set to 88.2 and Pulsar is showing 96kHz, but it should
>
>>play back at 88.2kHz but Pulsar is definitely slaved and though it may
>>show
>
>>96k, there's no way it could bplay back at any other sample rate than 88.2
>
>>if is it slaved.
>
> But is it REALLY slaved? Does the "set sample rate" window show
> a red light under the word "connected" at 88.2k? Because mine
> will sync & red-light-lock to 44.1, 48, and 96k, but not 88.2k.
>
> Neil
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by Neil on Sun, 10 Dec 2006 00:05:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>might be a dumb question, but do you need to/have you tried to terminate
the
>word clock?

Yep, tried it terminated, unterminated, semi-terminated (lol) -
man, I've tried everything on this & the Pulsar simply will not
sync to that samplerate.

Neil

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues!
Posted by Neil on Sun, 10 Dec 2006 07:19:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, it's official... this will absolutely NOT sync to 88.2k.
Gary (the guy that Deej & I got our cards from) checked it out;
and although it did sync to this saplerate in earlier versions,
it no longer does (WTF? would that be a "downgrade" into newer
versions?  lol).

It syncs perfectly to 44.1, 48, and 96, no issues there; but
not to 88.2k.

So... if there's no solution (Gary is going to check with

Creamware on Monday) for this samplerate, I will be selling
this brand-new Pulsar Project Card & Sync Plate at a discounted
rate. I'm thinking like $850 for the card & sync plate, which
is $100 off for a brand-new card and I'll ship it for free to
any CONUS address... it'll work fine for those of you working
at anything up to 96k (besides 88.2  lol).

So if anyone's interested, let me know.

neil DOT henderson AT sbcglobal.net

Neil

"Neil" <IUOIU@IOU.com> wrote:
>
>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>might be a dumb question, but do you need to/have you tried to terminate
>the
>>word clock?
>
>Yep, tried it terminated, unterminated, semi-terminated (lol) -
>man, I've tried everything on this & the Pulsar simply will not
>sync to that samplerate.
>
>Neil

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by AlexPlasko on Sun, 10 Dec 2006 07:51:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

less quantization errors. when you downsample to 44.1 it being 1/2 , instead
of  96/44.1. same thing with 48/44.1.plus he gets the nyquist frequency well
into doggy ear range recording at 88.2
"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:457baf82$1@linux...
>
> Neil, why don;t you just record @ 96k?? What's so special about 88.2..
> Man,
> in Nuendo, I only use 24 bit.. Paris, 16bi and both rates sound great.
>
> In Pro Tools HD, 96k recording sounds very good, soI can' see why you just
> won't track at that rate??
>

>
> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>
>>OK, it's official... this will absolutely NOT sync to 88.2k.
>>Gary (the guy that Deej & I got our cards from) checked it out;
>>and although it did sync to this saplerate in earlier versions,
>>it no longer does (WTF? would that be a "downgrade" into newer
>>versions?  lol).
>>
>>It syncs perfectly to 44.1, 48, and 96, no issues there; but
>>not to 88.2k.
>>
>>So... if there's no solution (Gary is going to check with
>>Creamware on Monday) for this samplerate, I will be selling
>>this brand-new Pulsar Project Card & Sync Plate at a discounted
>>rate. I'm thinking like $850 for the card & sync plate, which
>>is $100 off for a brand-new card and I'll ship it for free to
>>any CONUS address... it'll work fine for those of you working
>>at anything up to 96k (besides 88.2   lol).
>>
>>So if anyone's interested, let me know.
>>
>>neil DOT henderson AT sbcglobal.net
>>
>>
>>Neil
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>"Neil" <IUOIU@IOU.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>>might be a dumb question, but do you need to/have you tried to terminate
>>>the
>>>>word clock?
>>>
>>>Yep, tried it terminated, unterminated, semi-terminated (lol) -
>>>man, I've tried everything on this & the Pulsar simply will not
>>>sync to that samplerate.
>>>
>>>Neil
>>
>

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by LaMont on Sun, 10 Dec 2006 07:56:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neil, why don;t you just record @ 96k?? What's so special about 88.2.. Man, in Nuendo, I only use 24 bit.. Paris, 16bi and both rates sound great.

In Pro Tools HD, 96k recording sounds very good, soI can' see why you just won't track at that rate??

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>OK, it's official... this will absolutely NOT sync to 88.2k.
>Gary (the guy that Deej & I got our cards from) checked it out;
>and although it did sync to this saplerate in earlier versions,
>it no longer does (WTF? would that be a "downgrade" into newer
>versions?  lol).
>
>It syncs perfectly to 44.1, 48, and 96, no issues there; but
>not to 88.2k.
>
>So... if there's no solution (Gary is going to check with
>Creamware on Monday) for this samplerate, I will be selling
>this brand-new Pulsar Project Card & Sync Plate at a discounted
>rate. I'm thinking like $850 for the card & sync plate, which
>is $100 off for a brand-new card and I'll ship it for free to
>any CONUS address... it'll work fine for those of you working
>at anything up to 96k (besides 88.2   lol).
>
>So if anyone's interested, let me know.
>
>neil DOT henderson AT sbcglobal.net
>
>
>Neil
>
>
>
>
>
>"Neil" <IUOIU@IOU.com> wrote:
>>
>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>might be a dumb question, but do you need to/have you tried to terminate
>>the
>>>word clock?
>>
>>Yep, tried it terminated, unterminated, semi-terminated (lol) -

>>man, I've tried everything on this & the Pulsar simply will not
>>sync to that samplerate.
>>
>>Neil
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by Nil on Sun, 10 Dec 2006 16:51:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Alex, that's one reason... less rounding errors (and, in fact, who was it on this newsgroup who told me that when I first started getting into wanting to use higher sample rates - something tells me it was Aaron, I seem to recall?)

Another reason:
The difference between the CPU resources required to run lotsa tracks @ various plugins at 96k vs. 88.2k is not 9% more resources, as the numbers might imply (96 is roughly 9% higher than 88.2), it's considerably more - in fact, when I tried converting an 88.2k project to 96k (it had about 40 tracks & various assorted plugins), the 88.2 version was pushing my cpu meter to about 60% usage - the same project/same plugins at 96k pushed my CPU over the top & it wouldn't even play back.

The best reason yet:
I have a bunch of projects already recorded at 88.2k; it's not as if I can really see re-recording these just for this one card.

Neil

"alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
>less quantization errors. when you downsample to 44.1 it being 1/2 , instead

>of  96/44.1. same thing with 48/44.1.plus he gets the nyquist frequency
well
>into doggy ear range recording at 88.2
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:457baf82$1@linux...
>>
>> Neil, why don;t you just record @ 96k?? What's so special about 88.2..

>> Man,
>> in Nuendo, I only use 24 bit.. Paris, 16bi and both rates sound great.
>>

>> In Pro Tools HD, 96k recording sounds very good, soI can' see why you
just
>> won't track at that rate??
>>
>>
>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>OK, it's official... this will absolutely NOT sync to 88.2k.
>>>Gary (the guy that Deej & I got our cards from) checked it out;
>>>and although it did sync to this saplerate in earlier versions,
>>>it no longer does (WTF? would that be a "downgrade" into newer
>>>versions?  lol).
>>>
>>>It syncs perfectly to 44.1, 48, and 96, no issues there; but
>>>not to 88.2k.
>>>
>>>So... if there's no solution (Gary is going to check with
>>>Creamware on Monday) for this samplerate, I will be selling
>>>this brand-new Pulsar Project Card & Sync Plate at a discounted
>>>rate. I'm thinking like $850 for the card & sync plate, which
>>>is $100 off for a brand-new card and I'll ship it for free to
>>>any CONUS address... it'll work fine for those of you working
>>>at anything up to 96k (besides 88.2   lol).
>>>
>>>So if anyone's interested, let me know.
>>>
>>>neil DOT henderson AT sbcglobal.net
>>>
>>>
>>>Neil
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>"Neil" <IUOIU@IOU.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>>>might be a dumb question, but do you need to/have you tried to terminate
>>>>the
>>>>>word clock?
>>>>
>>>>Yep, tried it terminated, unterminated, semi-terminated (lol) -
>>>>man, I've tried everything on this & the Pulsar simply will not
>>>>sync to that samplerate.
>>>>
>>>>Neil
>>>

>>
>
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by Neil on Sun, 10 Dec 2006 17:02:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>Neil, why don;t you just record @ 96k?? What's so special about 88.2.. Man,
>in Nuendo, I only use 24 bit.. Paris, 16bi and both rates sound great.
>
>In Pro Tools HD, 96k recording sounds very good, soI can' see why you just
>won't track at that rate??

Because, numerologically, 88.2 works out to a "9"
(88.2: 8+8+2=18; 18: 1+8=9), while 96k works out to a "6"
(96: 9+6=15; 15: 1+5=6), so 88.2k is 3 better.

It's just my own little magic bit of audio mojo, baby!  lol

Seriously, though - see my response to Alex's respose to your
post - I answered your inquiry at the same time.

Neil

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by Don Nafe on Sun, 10 Dec 2006 18:23:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I guess the big question is are you taking an unacceptable sonic hit a 44.1
vs 88.2 and does the summing using the Pulsar offset the sonic hit you take
(if in fact you do)

If the answer is no...dump them ASAP

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:457c2f7d$1@linux...
>
> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Neil, why don;t you just record @ 96k?? What's so special about 88.2..
>>Man,
>>in Nuendo, I only use 24 bit.. Paris, 16bi and both rates sound great.

>>
>>In Pro Tools HD, 96k recording sounds very good, sol can' see why you just
>>won't track at that rate??
>
> Because, numerologically, 88.2 works out to a "9"
> (88.2: 8+8+2=18; 18: 1+8=9), while 96k works out to a "6"
> (96: 9+6=15; 15: 1+5=6), so 88.2k is 3 better.
>
> It's just my own little magic bit of audio mojo, baby!  lol
>
> Seriously, though - see my response to Alex's respose to your
> post - I answered your inquiry at the same time.
>
> Neil
>
>
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by DJ on Sun, 10 Dec 2006 20:43:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

<evil grin>

"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:457c65bb$1@linux...
>
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>I guess the big question is are you taking an unacceptable sonic hit a
>>44.1
>
>>vs 88.2 and does the summing using the Pulsar offset the sonic hit you
>>take
>
>>(if in fact you do)
>>
>>If the answer is no...dump them ASAP
>
> Do you mean if the answer is "yes", dump them ASAP? Or do you
> mean if the answer is "no" I should dump using 88.2k ASAP?
>
> Frankly I don't know if using the Pulsar for summing would make
> up for the sonic hit I would take at 44.1k - I can use Paris
> for summing right now & NOT have to take the hit to
> downconvert, though I have to go out through several Analog
> submixes to do this. My idea with the Pulsar was
> essentially: "What if I can sum in the digital domain via DSP;
> and if so, would that sound better than what I can do right

> now?" At this point I still can't find out, however, due to the
> inability of the Pulsar stuff to work at 88.2k.
>
> If you want to see the minor shitstorm that Deej & I started
> over on the Pulsar forum over this issue, go here:
>
> http://www.planetz.com/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=20885
>
>
> Neil

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by Nil on Sun, 10 Dec 2006 20:53:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>I guess the big question is are you taking an unacceptable sonic hit a 44.1

>vs 88.2 and does the summing using the Pulsar offset the sonic hit you take

>(if in fact you do)
>
>If the answer is no...dump them ASAP

Do you mean if the answer is "yes", dump them ASAP? Or do you
mean if the answer is "no" I should dump using 88.2k ASAP?

Frankly I don't know if using the Pulsar for summing would make
up for the sonic hit I would take at 44.1k - I can use Paris
for summing right now & NOT have to take the hit to
downconvert, though I have to go out through several Analog
submixes to do this. My idea with the Pulsar was
essentially: "What if I can sum in the digital domain via DSP;
and if so, would that sound better than what I can do right
now?" At this point I still can't find out, however, due to the
inability of the Pulsar stuff to work at 88.2k.

If you want to see the minor shitstorm that Deej & I started
over on the Pulsar forum over this issue, go here:

http://www.planetz.com/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=20885

Neil

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by LaMontt on Mon, 11 Dec 2006 02:37:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neil, In SX/Neundo, can you hear the difference btw 24bit vs 82?

I have yet to track a projject higher than 24bit. 16bit only in Pairis.

Why even start recording a such a high rate, when the 24/32 sounds great?

"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>Alex, that's one reason... less rounding errors (and, in fact,
>who was it on this newsgroup who told me that when I first
>started getting into wanting to use higher sample rates -
>something tells me it was Aaron, I seem to recall?)
>
>Another reason:
>The difference between the CPU resources required to run lotsa
>tracks @ various plugins at 96k vs. 88.2k is not 9% more
>resources, as the numbers might imply (96 is roughly 9% higher
>than 88.2), it's considerably more - in fact, when I tried
>converting an 88.2k project to 96k (it had about 40 tracks &
>various assorted plugins), the 88.2 version was pushing my cpu
>meter to about 60% usage - the same project/same plugins at 96k
>pushed my CPU over the top & it wouldn't even play back.
>
>The best reason yet:
>I have a bunch of projects already recorded at 88.2k; it's not
>as if I can really see re-recording these just for this one
>card.
>
>Neil
>
>
>
>"alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
>>less quantization errors. when you downsample to 44.1 it being 1/2 , instead
>
>>of 96/44.1. same thing with 48/44.1.plus he gets the nyquist frequency
>well
>>into doggy ear range recording at 88.2
>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:457baf82$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Neil, why don;t you just record @ 96k?? What's so special about 88.2..
>
>>> Man,
>>> in Nuendo, I only use 24 bit.. Paris, 16bi and both rates sound great.

>>>
>>> In Pro Tools HD, 96k recording sounds very good, soI can' see why you
>just
>>> won't track at that rate??
>>>
>>>
>>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>OK, it's official... this will absolutely NOT sync to 88.2k.
>>>>Gary (the guy that Deej & I got our cards from) checked it out;
>>>>and although it did sync to this saplerate in earlier versions,
>>>>it no longer does (WTF? would that be a "downgrade" into newer
>>>>versions?  lol).
>>>>
>>>>It syncs perfectly to 44.1, 48, and 96, no issues there; but
>>>>not to 88.2k.
>>>>
>>>>So... if there's no solution (Gary is going to check with
>>>>Creamware on Monday) for this samplerate, I will be selling
>>>>this brand-new Pulsar Project Card & Sync Plate at a discounted
>>>>rate. I'm thinking like $850 for the card & sync plate, which
>>>>is $100 off for a brand-new card and I'll ship it for free to
>>>>any CONUS address... it'll work fine for those of you working
>>>>at anything up to 96k (besides 88.2   lol).
>>>>
>>>>So if anyone's interested, let me know.
>>>>
>>>>neil DOT henderson AT sbcglobal.net
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Neil
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"Neil" <IUOIU@IOU.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>>>>might be a dumb question, but do you need to/have you tried to terminate
>>>>>the
>>>>>>word clock?
>>>>>
>>>>>Yep, tried it terminated, unterminated, semi-terminated (lol) -
>>>>>man, I've tried everything on this & the Pulsar simply will not
>>>>>sync to that samplerate.
>>>>>
>>>>>Neil

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

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by Chris Ludwig on Mon, 11 Dec 2006 02:44:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

HI Dj and Neil,
It's sadly amusing to see that Creamware's way of doing things hasn't changed at all sense I dealt with them years ago. Some of the user responses you all got are are hilarious in their denial of facts.
Any of the effects available could be coded and ran in a current native system. Creamware, TC and UAD types do not want to do it for the simple reason people could easily steal the software. The big thing that the Creamware DSP cards offer which same goes for Pro Tools is the ability to do it  very low latencies so as to make is seem real time. The UAD and TCs don't even offer this and actually quite the opposite. In native systems you can't run the latencies to their lowest settings when using these plug ins.

I have a feeling that the reason the does not do 88.2k is because of hardware limitations. It may be that the clocks they use on their cards which are fairly old right now may not have had the ability to support the 88.2k clock. People as fair as I've seen didn't really start trying to use 88.2k till the past 2/3 years but 96k has been around a couple more years so has been more commonly available on digital clocks.

Chris

DJ wrote:

><evil grin>
>
>"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:457c65bb$1@linux...
>
>
>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I guess the big question is are you taking an unacceptable sonic hit a
>>>44.1
>>>
>>>

>>>vs 88.2 and does the summing using the Pulsar offset the sonic hit you
>>>take
>>>
>>>
>>>(if in fact you do)
>>>
>>>If the answer is no...dump them ASAP
>>>
>>>
>>Do you mean if the answer is "yes", dump them ASAP? Or do you
>>mean if the answer is "no" I should dump using 88.2k ASAP?
>>
>>Frankly I don't know if using the Pulsar for summing would make
>>up for the sonic hit I would take at 44.1k - I can use Paris
>>for summing right now & NOT have to take the hit to
>>downconvert, though I have to go out through several Analog
>>submixes to do this. My idea with the Pulsar was
>>essentially: "What if I can sum in the digital domain via DSP;
>>and if so, would that sound better than what I can do right
>>now?" At this point I still can't find out, however, due to the
>>inability of the Pulsar stuff to work at 88.2k.
>>
>>If you want to see the minor shitstorm that Deej & I started
>>over on the Pulsar forum over this issue, go here:
>>
>>http://www.planetz.com/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=20885
>>
>>
>>Neil
>>
>>
>
>
>
>

--
Chris Ludwig
ADK
chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
(859) 635-5762

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by DJ on Mon, 11 Dec 2006 03:36:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's OK Chris. It will give me an excuse to figure out a workaround. I'm thinking that by building another DAW and putting my RME cards in it, slaving it to WC at 88.2, then slaving the Pulsar system timeline to ADAT sync generated by the RME system and streaming the audio via lightpipe from the RME system outputs to the Scope system inputs I should be able to get the damned thing to play back 88.2k audio files at the proper pitch.....now that makes a hell'uva lot of sense, doesn't it?

;oD

"Chris Ludwig" <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote in message news:457cc376$1@linux...
> HI Dj and Neil,
> It's sadly amusing to see that Creamware's way of doing things hasn't
> changed at all sense I dealt with them years ago. Some of the user
> responses you all got are are hilarious in their denial of facts.
> Any of the effects available could be coded and ran in a current native
> system. Creamware, TC and UAD types do not want to do it for the simple
> reason people could easily steal the software. The big thing that the
> Creamware DSP cards offer which same goes for Pro Tools is the ability to
> do it  very low latencies so as to make is seem real time. The UAD and TCs
> don't even offer this and actually quite the opposite. In native systems
> you can't run the latencies to their lowest settings when using these plug
> ins.
>
> I have a feeling that the reason the does not do 88.2k is because of
> hardware limitations. It may be that the clocks they use on their cards
> which are fairly old right now may not have had the ability to support the
> 88.2k clock. People as fair as I've seen didn't really start trying to use
> 88.2k till the past 2/3 years but 96k has been around a couple more years
> so has been more commonly available on digital clocks.
>
>
> Chris
>
> DJ wrote:
>
>><evil grin>
>>
>>"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:457c65bb$1@linux...
>>
>>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>>
>>>>I guess the big question is are you taking an unacceptable sonic hit a
>>>>44.1
>>>>

>>>>vs 88.2 and does the summing using the Pulsar offset the sonic hit you
>>>>take
>>>>
>>>>(if in fact you do)
>>>>
>>>>If the answer is no...dump them ASAP
>>>>
>>>Do you mean if the answer is "yes", dump them ASAP? Or do you
>>>mean if the answer is "no" I should dump using 88.2k ASAP?
>>>
>>>Frankly I don't know if using the Pulsar for summing would make
>>>up for the sonic hit I would take at 44.1k - I can use Paris
>>>for summing right now & NOT have to take the hit to
>>>downconvert, though I have to go out through several Analog
>>>submixes to do this. My idea with the Pulsar was
>>>essentially: "What if I can sum in the digital domain via DSP;
>>>and if so, would that sound better than what I can do right
>>>now?" At this point I still can't find out, however, due to the
>>>inability of the Pulsar stuff to work at 88.2k.
>>>
>>>If you want to see the minor shitstorm that Deej & I started
>>>over on the Pulsar forum over this issue, go here:
>>>
>>>http://www.planetz.com/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=20885
>>>
>>>
>>>Neil
>>
>>
>>
>
> --
> Chris Ludwig
> ADK
> chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
> www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
> (859) 635-5762

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by Jesse Skeens on Mon, 11 Dec 2006 10:43:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
>less quantization errors. when you downsample to 44.1 it being 1/2 , instead

>of  96/44.1. same thing with 48/44.1.plus he gets the nyquist frequency
well

>into doggy ear range recording at 88.2

That's a myth.  Sample rate converters upsample to a common rate and then downsample to the choosen one while also filtering.

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by Nil on Mon, 11 Dec 2006 15:33:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"LaMont" <jjdpro@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>Neil, In SX/Neundo, can you hear the difference btw 24bit vs 82?

You mean 32, right? And the answer is: I don't know, in terms of tracking a whole project at 32-bit, never done that... I use 24-bit 88.2k to track & if I'm mixing down to stems I'll do the stems at 32-bit. Same thing if I'm going straight to a 2-buss mix that I'm going to do sort of a light "mastering" or pre-mastering on... I'll render the 2-buss mix down a 32-bit/88.2k, then use Ozone on either the 2-buss mix itself (in this case) or the master module of the stems mix in those instances.

>Why even start recording a such a high rate, when the 24/32
>sounds great?

Because I am a complete & utter moron, apparently... I know that more people have been getting into using this particular samplerate lately, but it seems the vast majority of people who don't use Pro-Tools are dead-set against going above 44.1 (or sometimes 48k), while a lot of pepole using PT are going for 96k and some are apparently starting to use 88.2k - a couple of posts ago in this thread I answered your above question on the samplerate already... unless you're asking something different now, and I don't get what you mean?

Neil

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by TCB on Mon, 11 Dec 2006 16:34:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

While I agree that the same things could be done with native DSP code, if the only way to get a John Bowen synth is to buy a Pulsar, because Bowen prefers copy protection to size of potential market, then that's that. I

was worried about stability but if that is taken care of then I'm in.

I also think it's odd that people will pay absurd amounts of money for esoteric analog recording hardware (mics, pres, cables, EQs, comps) when if even one of the links in the chain is subpar, even the quality of power in the building, can 86 those thousands of dollars spent. But that makes perfect sense, in contrast to buying an esoteric DSP card that only sounds a bit better than the native apps (the NI Prophet sounds very good, the Creamware Prophet sounds sick). Isn't that a strange double standard?

None of which means I might not be cursing the day I ordered a Pulsar, but seeing the number of people there using the gear makes me somewhat optomistic. I just think it's odd that the pursuit of superior sound is fine when it's tube amps and vintage limiters, but it's silly when it's a DSP synth.

TCB

Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>HI Dj and Neil,
>It's sadly amusing to see that Creamware's way of doing things hasn't
>changed at all sense I dealt with them years ago. Some of the user
>responses you all got are are hilarious in their denial of facts.
>Any of the effects available could be coded and ran in a current native

>system. Creamware, TC and UAD types do not want to do it for the simple

>reason people could easily steal the software. The big thing that the
>Creamware DSP cards offer which same goes for Pro Tools is the ability
>to do it  very low latencies so as to make is seem real time. The UAD
>and TCs don't even offer this and actually quite the opposite. In native

>systems you can't run the latencies to their lowest settings when using

>these plug ins.
>
>I have a feeling that the reason the does not do 88.2k is because of
>hardware limitations. It may be that the clocks they use on their cards

>which are fairly old right now may not have had the ability to support
>the 88.2k clock. People as fair as I've seen didn't really start trying

>to use 88.2k till the past 2/3 years but 96k has been around a couple
>more years so has been more commonly available on digital clocks.
>
>
>Chris
>
>DJ wrote:

>
>><evil grin>
>>
>>"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:457c65bb$1@linux...
>>
>>
>>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>I guess the big question is are you taking an unacceptable sonic hit
a
>>>>44.1
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>vs 88.2 and does the summing using the Pulsar offset the sonic hit you

>>>>take
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>(if in fact you do)
>>>>
>>>>If the answer is no...dump them ASAP
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Do you mean if the answer is "yes", dump them ASAP? Or do you
>>>mean if the answer is "no" I should dump using 88.2k ASAP?
>>>
>>>Frankly I don't know if using the Pulsar for summing would make
>>>up for the sonic hit I would take at 44.1k - I can use Paris
>>>for summing right now & NOT have to take the hit to
>>>downconvert, though I have to go out through several Analog
>>>submixes to do this. My idea with the Pulsar was
>>>essentially: "What if I can sum in the digital domain via DSP;
>>>and if so, would that sound better than what I can do right
>>>now?" At this point I still can't find out, however, due to the
>>>inability of the Pulsar stuff to work at 88.2k.
>>>
>>>If you want to see the minor shitstorm that Deej & I started
>>>over on the Pulsar forum over this issue, go here:
>>>
>>>http://www.planetz.com/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=20885
>>>
>>>
>>>Neil
>>>
>>>
>>
>>

>>
>>
>
>--
>Chris Ludwig
>ADK
>chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
>www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
>(859) 635-5762

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by Neil on Mon, 11 Dec 2006 18:28:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thad, from what I can tell you probably won't have any stability issues with the Pulsar stuff... I was playing with it at 44.1k and the only thing I nticed is that a couple of plugins sure seem to take awhile to load (like ten or 15 seconds - strange when it's got all that DSP power on-board), but they don't "hang" once they're loaded & you start using them or anything like that.

As for your other comment about spending tons of $$$ for a vintage mic or pre, but not being willing to fork it over for some other core need... I'm with you there - this is why I'm trying the Pulsar stuff - mt feelinds are that I've got killer signal chain stuff happening in terms of mics & pres, pristine hi-rez convertors, but I'm still not able to get the full mix sound that I'm looking for... short of going PTHD (which I suppose I could do, but that's just a TON of money); the Pulsar stuff - IF I can get it to work at 88.2 - maybe has a shot at getting me there.

Neil

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>
>While I agree that the same things could be done with native DSP code, if
>the only way to get a John Bowen synth is to buy a Pulsar, because Bowen
>prefers copy protection to size of potential market, then that's that. I
>was worried about stability but if that is taken care of then I'm in.
>
>I also think it's odd that people will pay absurd amounts of money for esoteric
>analog recording hardware (mics, pres, cables, EQs, comps) when if even
one
>of the links in the chain is subpar, even the quality of power in the building,

>can 86 those thousands of dollars spent. But that makes perfect sense, in
>contrast to buying an esoteric DSP card that only sounds a bit better than
>the native apps (the NI Prophet sounds very good, the Creamware Prophet
sounds
>sick). Isn't that a strange double standard?
>
>None of which means I might not be cursing the day I ordered a Pulsar, but
>seeing the number of people there using the gear makes me somewhat optomistic.
>I just think it's odd that the pursuit of superior sound is fine when it's
>tube amps and vintage limiters, but it's silly when it's a DSP synth.
>
>TCB
>
>Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:
>>HI Dj and Neil,
>>It's sadly amusing to see that Creamware's way of doing things hasn't
>>changed at all sense I dealt with them years ago. Some of the user
>>responses you all got are are hilarious in their denial of facts.
>>Any of the effects available could be coded and ran in a current native
>
>>system. Creamware, TC and UAD types do not want to do it for the simple
>
>>reason people could easily steal the software. The big thing that the
>>Creamware DSP cards offer which same goes for Pro Tools is the ability

>>to do it  very low latencies so as to make is seem real time. The UAD
>>and TCs don't even offer this and actually quite the opposite. In native
>
>>systems you can't run the latencies to their lowest settings when using
>
>>these plug ins.
>>
>>I have a feeling that the reason the does not do 88.2k is because of
>>hardware limitations. It may be that the clocks they use on their cards
>
>>which are fairly old right now may not have had the ability to support

>>the 88.2k clock. People as fair as I've seen didn't really start trying
>
>>to use 88.2k till the past 2/3 years but 96k has been around a couple
>>more years so has been more commonly available on digital clocks.
>>
>>
>>Chris
>>
>>DJ wrote:
>>
>>><evil grin>

>>>
>>>"Neil" <IUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:457c65bb$1@linux...
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I guess the big question is are you taking an unacceptable sonic hit
>a
>>>>>44.1
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>vs 88.2 and does the summing using the Pulsar offset the sonic hit you
>
>>>>>take
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>(if in fact you do)
>>>>>
>>>>>If the answer is no...dump them ASAP
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Do you mean if the answer is "yes", dump them ASAP? Or do you
>>>>mean if the answer is "no" I should dump using 88.2k ASAP?
>>>>
>>>>Frankly I don't know if using the Pulsar for summing would make
>>>>up for the sonic hit I would take at 44.1k - I can use Paris
>>>>for summing right now & NOT have to take the hit to
>>>>downconvert, though I have to go out through several Analog
>>>>submixes to do this. My idea with the Pulsar was
>>>>essentially: "What if I can sum in the digital domain via DSP;
>>>>and if so, would that sound better than what I can do right
>>>>now?" At this point I still can't find out, however, due to the
>>>>inability of the Pulsar stuff to work at 88.2k.
>>>>
>>>>If you want to see the minor shitstorm that Deej & I started
>>>>over on the Pulsar forum over this issue, go here:
>>>>
>>>>http://www.planetz.com/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=20885
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Neil
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>

>>
>>--
>>Chris Ludwig
>>ADK
>>chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>
>>www.adkproaudio.com <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>
>>(859) 635-5762
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by AlexPlasko on Mon, 11 Dec 2006 21:45:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I was referring to software conversion, as in wavelab,not sample rate
converters
"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote in message news:457d2827$1@linux...
>
> "alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
>>less quantization errors. when you downsample to 44.1 it being 1/2 ,
>>instead
>
>>of  96/44.1. same thing with 48/44.1.plus he gets the nyquist frequency
> well
>>into doggy ear range recording at 88.2
>
> That's a myth.  Sample rate converters upsample to a common rate and then
> downsample to the choosen one while also filtering.
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by Jesse Skeens on Tue, 12 Dec 2006 00:17:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So was I.

"alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
>I was referring to software conversion, as in wavelab,not sample rate
>converters
>"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote in message news:457d2827$1@linux...
>>
>> "alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
>>>less quantization errors. when you downsample to 44.1 it being 1/2 ,
>>>instead
>>
>>>of  96/44.1. same thing with 48/44.1.plus he gets the nyquist frequency

>> well
>>>into doggy ear range recording at 88.2
>>
>> That's a myth.  Sample rate converters upsample to a common rate and then
>> downsample to the choosen one while also filtering.
>>
>
>

---

Subject: Re: The Pulsar Carnage Continues! Record @ 96
Posted by AlexPlasko on Tue, 12 Dec 2006 03:16:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

your right, interpolation /decimation is the common practice.thanks for
pointing that out jesse:-)
"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote in message news:457de6fc$1@linux...
>
>
> So was I.
>
> "alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
>>I was referring to software conversion, as in wavelab,not sample rate
>>converters
>>"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote in message
>>news:457d2827$1@linux...
>>>
>>> "alex plasko" <alex.plasko@snet.net> wrote:
>>>>less quantization errors. when you downsample to 44.1 it being 1/2 ,
>>>>instead
>>>
>>>>of  96/44.1. same thing with 48/44.1.plus he gets the nyquist frequency
>>> well
>>>>into doggy ear range recording at 88.2
>>>
>>> That's a myth.  Sample rate converters upsample to a common rate and
>>> then
>>> downsample to the choosen one while also filtering.
>>>
>>
>>
>

---