
Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 04:39:58 GMT

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

Gene,

There's a whole generation of folks out there now who have likely never heard, or at least apid attention to a vinyl recording and who have been listening to *the industry standard* since *the industry standard* became entrenched about 10 years ago. I agree that it's a matter of comfort/familiarity with digital sounding recordings, just like vinyl and tape seems familiar to us. Radio is so compressed and sounds so awful these days that playing digitized old vinyl recordings really makes them sound a lot worse than the newer digital recordings so there's not even close to a level playing field. It seems to all about convenience and loudness these days, though I don't think that the new PT HD sounds bad either. There are 5 studios here, .mine, one that uses DP and 3 that use PTHD. All of us can produce a professional sounding product. I'm going to be working more at 96k in the future which will keep me *in the box* and native. It will be really interesting to learn to mix more conservatively. I've never done it.

Regards,
Deej

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message
news:443c852c\$1@linux...

>

>

> I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily
> for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.

>

> When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still
sounds

> different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
has

> more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more
aggressive

> when you push the gain stages.

>

> So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
because

> its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is
closer

> to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?

>

>

> I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely a

> learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.

>

> In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain unnamed),

> I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big

> and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and not

> at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number of

> recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWs

> as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more important

> it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about

> 10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.

>

> Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How many

> American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal music?

> Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.

Labels

> work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,

> all the labels want the same crappy sound.

>

> Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I thought

> good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at least

> one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the realities

> of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.

>

> My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself

> working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made decisions

> in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy

> "Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT sound".

> (Insert appropriate emoticon).

>

> Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves

> SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound of

> better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and I

> can experiment with a mix of the two styles.

>

> What does all this mean? Nothing other than I understand why some people

> may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences

> are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't

> see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth fighting

> over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>
> And don't forget the cyclical nature of fashion almost guarantees that one
> day we will once again be "in".
>
> Gene

Subject: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 04:42:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.

When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still sounds different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still has more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more aggressive when you push the gain stages.

So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS because it actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is closer to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?

I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely a learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.

In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain unnamed), I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and not at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number of recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWS as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more important it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about 10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.

Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How many American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal music? Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens. Labels work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy, all the labels want the same crappy sound.

Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I thought good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at least one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the realities of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.

My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made decisions in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy "Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT sound". (Insert appropriate emoticon).

Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound of better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and I can experiment with a mix of the two styles.

What does all this mean? Nothing other than I understand why some people may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth fighting over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.

day we will once again be "in".

Gene

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Kim](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 08:32:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS because
>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is closer
>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?

This post reminded me that I haven't listened to the Beatles Let It Be Naked in a while. ;o) And I do love ths sound of that album. Soft and warm and analog, but with elements of clarity that only come from digital processing...

....but I don't understand what you're getting at? ;o) Hehe...

....suffice to say, it's now playing...

"All through the night, I me mine, I me mine, I me mine..."

I think you're right though. In a way.

On one hand I would say I think Paris has a sound, whereas most good digital systems these days are cold and pure. Hence one could argue Paris is coloured where other DAWs are not.

On the other hand, part of me still thinks that air, where the "summing bus" mathematics is done in nature, may not necessarily be as pure in it's additions as is a digital DAW. For example, I would think that air, when heavily compressed, would offer more resistance the more it was compressed. It's not just doing to keep giving. It will resist more with greater compression. So the louder the sound, and the more you add sound together, the more you would get a mild compression effect on the peaks. In analog systems, and possibly Paris, you get this effect. It's only slight, but it's there. In digital systems you don't.

I've never seen or heard anything about how sound works in the air and how clean the maths is. People seem to assume it to be pure clean maths, but I find that unlikely. Air is a dirty mixed up substance full of different gases and particles, and sounds by nature are waves crossing in different directions, intersecting, and doing all kinds of things.

Hence, which system is coloured? The digital or the analog? Paris or Protools or, indeed, air? I suggested this in a post a while back I'm pretty sure.

But I think there's certainly variation in what various people prefer sound wise. Digital is currently "in". Overcompressed is certainly in. Mind you I think this is the way of the future. People are increasingly wanting everything in little compact packages that are easier to digest. Getting somebody to make you a pizza with chilli that's actually hot is becoming increasingly difficult. I'd like to think that one day Paris, and the more analog sound will be back in, but I suspect not. I beleive it will always have a following though.

It certainly has more funk and soul in my books. :o)

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Neil](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 13:04:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis

Would that be Merle Haggis?

:)

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>
>

>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily
>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>
>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still sounds
>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
has
>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more aggressive
>when you push the gain stages.
>
>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
because
>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is closer
>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
>
>
>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely a
>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>
>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain unnamed),
>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big
>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
not
>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
of
>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWS
>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more important
>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>
>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
many
>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal music?
>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens. Labels
>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>
>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I thought
>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at least
>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the realities
>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>
>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself
>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made decisions
>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT sound".
>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>
>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves

>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound of
>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and I
>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>
> What does all this mean? Nothing other than I understand why some people
>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences
>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't
>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth fighting
>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>

>day we will once again be "in".
>
>Gene

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [geo](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 13:06:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah and everything ends up as mp3 for Ipods. So who cares?
I was surprised who cares. Just got done doing a cd project for the "young and hip". They say when they play music done here, their peers remark it sounds different....and really good. So this generation raised on cd, like this "warm" sound Paris delivers.
And if I want that tight slappy digital sound of new PT, I simply boost a broad "Q" centered around 4500, dump a little 2-300 on the Massive across the two bus, and viola. Then on the mixdown machine...hard limit to whatever suits..
Still will probably be forced into Steiney world for cool midi plugs and such....vertical learning. Technology beckons and I've been 8 years in Paris and haven't given a rip. But maybe now new tech is ready to equal Paris performance. Thoughts?
Geo

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:443cbb39\$1@linux...
>
> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
> >Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWs because
> >its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is closer
> >to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
>
> This post reminded me that I haven't listened to the Beatles Let It Be Naked

> in a while. ;o) And I do love the sound of that album. Soft and warm and
 > analog, but with elements of clarity that only come from digital
 processing...

>

> ...but I don't understand what you're getting at? ;o) Hehe...

>

> ...suffice to say, it's now playing...

>

> "All through the night, I me mine, I me mine, I me mine..."

>

> I think you're right though. In a way.

>

> On one hand I would say I think Paris has a sound, whereas most good
 digital
 > systems these days are cold and pure. Hence one could argue Paris is
 coloured
 > where other DAWs are not.

>

> On the other hand, part of me still thinks that air, where the "summing
 bus"

> mathematics is done in nature, may not necessarily be as pure in its
 additions
 > as is a digital DAW. For example, I would think that air, when heavily
 compressed,
 > would offer more resistance the more it was compressed. It's not just
 doing
 > to keep giving. It will resist more with greater compression. So the
 louder
 > the sound, and the more you add sound together, the more you would get a
 > mild compression effect on the peaks. In analog systems, and possibly
 Paris,
 > you get this effect. It's only slight, but it's there. In digital systems
 > you don't.

>

> I've never seen or heard anything about how sound works in the air and how
 > clean the maths is. People seem to assume it to be pure clean maths, but
 > I find that unlikely. Air is a dirty mixed up substance full of different
 > gases and particles, and sounds by nature are waves crossing in different
 > directions, intersecting, and doing all kinds of things.

>

> Hence, which system is coloured? The digital or the analog? Paris or
 Protools

> or, indeed, air? I suggested this in a post a while back I'm pretty sure.

>

> But I think there's certainly variation in what various people prefer
 sound
 > wise. Digital is currently "in". Overcompressed is certainly in. Mind you
 > I think this is the way of the future. People are increasingly wanting

everything

> in little compact packages that are easier to digest. Getting somebody to
> make you a pizza with chilli that's actually hot is becoming increasingly
> difficult. I'd like to think that one day Paris, and the more analog sound
> will be back in, but I suspect not. I beleive it will always have a

following

> though.

>

> It certainly has more funk and soul in my books. :o)

>

> Cheers,

> Kim.

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 14:06:04 GMT

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

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still sounds

>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still

has

>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more aggressive

>when you push the gain stages.

I put a PT rig in for a graduate school composition program and,
for classical at least, I think HD still sounds gritchy on the top
end. Paris can have more of an analog tape sound, but if you
don't push it, it sounds pristine enough for orchestras, and frankly
killed my Sonic Solutions rig on the same material. So, I still see
no reason whatsoever to care about PT's, so I don't.

>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
because

>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is closer

>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?

Both. Depends on how you use it.

>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely a

>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.

Well, the only thing in audio is what gets the music across, and what
the client will pay for, so it's hard to speak of truth in this context.

Just because someone likes something or will pay for it, doesn't mean it sounds good, yet it is hard to open our minds to new approaches sometimes innit?

Seems to me that both sides have a point.

>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain unnamed),
>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big
>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and not
>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number of
>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWs
>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more important
>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.

If the client has no ears, there is nothing you can do but give them their sound or walk away. In my case, a band of pretty young people love the Paris sound, and I mix pretty clean compared to some of you.

>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How many
>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal music?

Why would anyone listen to microtonal music?? yipes!

Just kidding. It sounds awfully out of tune at first doesn't it?
I for one am tired of the "dumb teenager" cynicism of the music biz. Teenagers are not that dumb. The industry and radio are dumb and even evil for not exposing them to more great music.

>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis...

Here you go:

<http://www.badhaggis.com>

heh heh good band actually.

>And it not just teens. Labels
>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>all the labels want the same crappy sound.

Someone said to me years ago about the industry: "if the wrong guy stopped short on Hollywood, 50,000 noses are gonna go right up a lot of behinds"

So bugger 'em. I say go your own way. Have a sound all your own and make them play catch-up.

>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I thought
>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at least
>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the realities
>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.

WE make the damn market. Following trends leaves you always behind.

>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself
>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made decisions
>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT sound".
>(Insert appropriate emoticon).

And there's nothing wrong with it. Yet you will still have clients where great sound will rock their world.

>day we will once again be "in".

Bingo.

Best wishes,

DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 05:04:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gene,
Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW "nastalgic" sound thing.

Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I watched the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer sounding DAW technology.

The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old" guard Engineers who ears are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.

I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year 1982 as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine.. The sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..

In other words, where is the muddled drums? the muddy bass? the muddled vocals that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??

Well, when we attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic was about to occur!! Out comes the Putech(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) Gates, DBX160..2 hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinking again, "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, with a ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..

So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARIS. The pro Engineers on this site praised it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we lawed every other digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm enough, not dull , or muddy enough..

This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd whined,screamed, bitched, moaned on every forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as well as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless they has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ, Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP, Bomb factory)....

So, like magic, companies pour massive resources to reclaim the glory days with the birth of the "Vintage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to make your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, all in all..Make the mixes sound like 1975!!!

Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro Tools HD and Nuendo, Sonar there's a shift occurring in the "Holy-Grail " RECORD-SOUND... With Garage bands, rap artists, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having NO prior knowledge,nor the formal training to 'get the 1975" sound, we have the High-Fidelity DAW sound in all its glory!! ..Yipee!!

Still, the old guard continues to hold its thumb on the DAW market and keep driving manufacturers to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others) that challenge the old "muddy up the mix crowd).

Today kids are brought on the Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to hear that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..

So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian Tankersly(I adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to have all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight DAW companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.

For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent state of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris is still in my rig, but I will no longer fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters. Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters. Let's evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>
>
>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily
>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>
>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still sounds
>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
has
>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more aggressive
>when you push the gain stages.
>
>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
because
>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is closer
>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
>
>
>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely a
>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>
>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain unnamed),
>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big
>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
not
>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
of
>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWS
>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more important
>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about

>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>
>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How many
>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal music?
>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens. Labels
>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>
>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I thought
>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at least
>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the realities
>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>
>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself
>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made decisions
>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT sound".
>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>
>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves
>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
>of
>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and I
>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>
> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some people
>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences
>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't
>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth fighting
>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>

>day we will once again be "in".
>
>Gene

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 05:53:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LaMont,
I agree with much of what you said but not completely.
I think you could apply the same logic to all aspects of the recordings arts.

much cleaner than a 1176, but that does not mean that I would prefer the
TLM170 or the GML 8900 in most cases.

some of my preferences come from does not mean I have changes my mind. I

I do however feel I will need to stay somewhat in tune with the current sound for any major market projects that I do in the future.

A separate issue is what mastering engineers under the influence of A&R men are doing to records before they are released. Trend or not I think that is criminal.

So I recognize my own prejudices, I think I clearly see the new trends, but

gene

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

>

>Gene,

>Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW "nastalgic"
>sound thing.

>

>Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I watched
>the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer
sounding
>DAW technology.

>

>The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who ears
>are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.

>

>I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
1982

>as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
The

>sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking
>"This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments
>were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..

>

>In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled vocals
>that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??

>

>Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
was

>about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2
>hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
>"Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha

>ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..

>

>So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site priased

>it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we lawed

>every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm enough,

>not dull , or muddy enough..

>This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on every

>forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as well

>as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless they

>has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ, Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,

>Bomb factory)....

>

>So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys days

>with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to make

>your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make

the

>mixes sound like 1975!!!

>

>Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro Tools

>HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail " RECORD-SOUND...

>With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having

NO

>prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have

the

>High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!

>

>Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and

keep

>driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every

>now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others) that

>challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).

>

>Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to hear

>that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..

>

>So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian Tankersly(I

>adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to have

>all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight DAW

>companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market

>segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.

>

>For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent

state

>of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris

>is still in my rig, but I will no longer

>fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund

>with bottom..So be it..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.

>Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice

>wide -spacious,clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu converters.
Let's
>evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 06:08:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 4/13/06 11:04 PM, in article 443f2d4d\$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote:

Ditto gentlemen, and well said. I'm much closer to the high fidelity, clarity is king crowd than saturate the tape crowd and always have been, but that's how I grew up (even with 60's and 70's bands I listened to), and my personal taste. And I agree with Gene, I also believe much of what we like is based on what we learn and associate with the best music listening times in our lives. A revelation on sound came for me when a friend introduced me to "high end" recordings from Sheffield Labs - James Newton Howard for one. Great music, and stunning recordings. So much effort went into getting a pristine sound, but now we've come full circle and want to rough up the pristine sound we have to get back what we worked so hard to eliminate.

I used to transfer all my records as soon as I bought them to metal cassettes on really nice Harmon Kardon deck - immediately from wrapper to turntable, needle down as I hit record - not a finger print on the edge, not a dust speck to drift onto the platter. Cassette wasn't better, but it was cleaner for a longer time (and car-compatible :-). We had destatic brushes and doodads to clean up the used records when possible, but it was never clean enough. Then came CDs - I saved so many hours by getting a CD player! ;-)

I've thought for a long time that much of what we hear in music and judge standards by is evolved preference. In truth, is there any absolute, and better yet, should there be? To some degree of course there always have been - bass in the middle to keep records from skipping, unless it's EQ'd out; and now we have 0 dBFS. The squashed war may be short lived if it even still rests in artists and engineers' hands.

Regards,
Dedric

> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent state
> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris
> is still in my rig, but I will no longer

> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund
 > with bottom..So be it..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.
 > Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice
 > wide -spacious,clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu converters. Let's
 > evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
 >
 >
 >
 >
 > "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
 >>
 >>
 >> I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily
 >> for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
 >>
 >> When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still sounds
 >> different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
 > has
 >> more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more
 >> aggressive
 >> when you push the gain stages.
 >>
 >> So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
 > because
 >> its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is closer
 >> to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
 >>
 >>
 >> I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely a
 >> learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
 >>
 >> In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain unnamed),
 >> I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big
 >> and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
 > not
 >> at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
 > of
 >> recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWS
 >> as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more important
 >> it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
 >> 10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
 >>
 >> Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
 > many
 >> American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal music?
 >> Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens. Labels
 >> work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
 >> all the labels want the same crappy sound.

>>
>> Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I thought
>> good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at least
>> one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the realities
>> of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>
>> My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself
>> working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made decisions
>> in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
>> "Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT
>> sound".
>> (Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>
>> Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves
>> SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
> of
>> better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and I
>> can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>
>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some people
>> may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences
>> are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't
>> see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth fighting
>> over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>

>> day we will once again be "in".
>>
>> Gene
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Kim](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 06:41:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think there's a degree of truth in the idea that people get set in the way something should sound and don't like change.

I don't think I support the idea though that Protools' sound is superior, and the future, and that Paris supporters are just set in their ways.

Even if I was to accept that Protools is cleaner, clean isn't always better, that's been well proven. If cleanest was always the best, we'd all plug guitars straight in to the desk, or the cleanest pre we had. We wouldn't want to muddy up the sound by running through an amp, and then into a mic. I mean that's just going to dirty the sound. That's an extreme and obvious example of somewhere where a dirty sound is fairly universally considered superior.

Of course there are many guitars on records that are plugged straight in. Sometimes it's what you want. Different strokes...

I remember something Dave Stewart of the Eurythmics said back in the 80's. He said "There are no bad sounds, just bad uses for sounds". He had all kinds of instruments, some keyboards as cheap as \$10 which made cheezy tinny crackly sounds, but sometimes that's what you want.

People like different sounds, and different production styles. They always will. Are there Paris owners who only like Paris because it sounds "vintage"? Probably. Is that wrong? No. How can it be wrong to like something because it reminds you of something you enjoy?

As per my other post, I'm not convinced that the air's natural summing bus performs exact addition like that in Protools anyhow. Matter of fact I'm almost certain it would not. Does that make Protools wrong? No, it makes it a sound. It's a sound, to add to the many other options available for making sound. It happens to be the sound that people are used to at the moment, and hence it's very popular.

I imagine Protools is not much closer at emulating what happens in the air than analog gear, or Paris. Most things in nature have logarithmic curves. Like how the faster you drive the more air resistance you get. Like how the closer you get to the speed of light the more power it takes to go faster. I'd say with some confidence that air pressure works the same. The higher the pressure you want, the harder you'd have to push, and for double the pressure, you'd need to press slightly more than twice as hard. Sound being waves of pressure, this would give them a logarithmic curve. Adding together two sounds of equal volume and you won't get double the volume, you'll get 99.9% more volume, because to create double the pressure takes more than double the energy. Protools doesn't work like that. But it is a sound, and many people like it, so good luck to them. I think saying that Protools, or any sound, is "right" is dangerous.

I don't think vintage plugs etc are holding anybody back. They're just options. They allow you to achieve a sound within the digital domain.

I think the availability of different options is a great thing. What is most dangerous is anybody who claims that any system, old, new, or whatever, is superior in every way to any other system. Every system, and every sound, is superior to others in some ways, and inferior in others.

The art form is in choosing the right sounds for the right moments. If the sound that you're after requires or benefits from a particular system, then use that system.

Personally I'm still not a fan of the Protools sound. I'm not nearly as against it as I used to be though. But I'd rather the sound of Paris, even if some

consider it muddy.

Cheers,
Kim.

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

>
>Gene,
>Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW "nastalgic"
>sound thing.
>
>Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I watched
>the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer
sounding
>DAW technology.
>
>The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who ears
>are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddied up recordings.
>
>I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
1982
>as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
The
>sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking
>"This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments
>were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..
>
>In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddied vocals
>that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
>
>Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
was
>about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2
>hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
>"Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha
>ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
>
>So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site priased
>it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we lawed
>every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm enough,
>not dull , or muddy enough..
>This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wine,screemed, bitched, moaned on every
>forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as well
>as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless they
>has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ, Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
>Bomb factory)....
>
>So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys days

>with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to make
 >your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
 the
 >mixes sound like 1975!!!
 >
 >Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro Tools
 >HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail " RECORD-SOUND...
 >With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
 NO
 >prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have
 the
 >High-Fedelity DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
 >
 >Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and
 keep
 >driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every
 >now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others) that
 >challenge the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 >
 >Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to hear
 >that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 >
 >So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian Tankersly(I
 >adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to have
 >all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight DAW
 >companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market
 >segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
 >
 >For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
 state
 >of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris
 >is still in my rig, but I will no longer
 >fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund
 >with bottom..So be it..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.
 >Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice
 >wide -spacious,clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu converters.
 Let's
 >evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
 >>
 >>
 >>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily
 >>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
 >>

>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still sounds
>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
>has
>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more aggressive
>>when you push the gain stages.
>>
>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
>because
>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is closer
>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
>>
>>
>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely
a
>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>
>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain unnamed),
>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big
>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
>not
>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>of
>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWS
>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more important
>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>
>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
>many
>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal music?
>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
Labels
>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>
>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I thought
>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at
least
>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the realities
>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>
>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself
>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made decisions
>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT
sound".
>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>

>> Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves
>> SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
> of
>> better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and
I
>> can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>
>> What does all this mean? Nothing other than I understand why some people
>> may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences
>> are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't
>> see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth fighting
>> over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>

one

>> day we will once again be "in".

>>

>> Gene

>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 06:51:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good post, LaMont

--

Martin Harrington
www.lendaneer-sound.com

"LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...

>

> Gene,

> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW

> "nostalgic"

> sound thing.

>

> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I

> watched

> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fidelity, newer

> sounding

> DAW technology.

>

> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old" guard Engineers who

> ears

> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.

>

> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
 > 1982
 > as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
 > The
 > sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking
 > "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments
 > were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..
 >
 > In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddied
 > vocals
 > that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
 >
 > Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
 > was
 > about to occur!! Out comes the Putec(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2
 > hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
 > "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha
 > ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 >
 > So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site priased
 > it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we
 > lawed
 > every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
 > enough,
 > not dull , or muddy enough..
 > This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on every
 > forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as
 > well
 > as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
 > they
 > has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 > Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 > Bomb factory)....
 >
 > So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys days
 > with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to make
 > your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
 > the
 > mixes sound like 1975!!!
 >
 > Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro
 > Tools
 > HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
 > RECORD-SOUND...
 > With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having NO
 > prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have
 > the
 > High-Fedeliity DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!

>
> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and
> keep
> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every
> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others) that
> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
>
> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to
> hear
> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
>
> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
> Tankersly(I
> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to have
> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight DAW
> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market
> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
>
> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
> state
> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris
> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund
> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.
> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice
> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters.
> Let's
> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>
>
>
>
>
> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily
>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>>
>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still
>>sounds
>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
> has
>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more
>>aggressive
>>when you push the gain stages.
>>
>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
> because

>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is
>>closer
>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
>>
>>
>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely a
>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>
>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
>>unnamed),
>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big
>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
> not
>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
> of
>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWs
>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
>>important
>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>
>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
> many
>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal
>>music?
>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
>>Labels
>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>
>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I
>>thought
>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at
>>least
>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
>>realities
>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>
>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself
>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made
>>decisions
>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT
>>sound".
>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>
>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves
>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound

> of
>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and I
>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>
>> What does all this mean? Nothing other than I understand why some people
>>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences
>>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't
>>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
>>fighting
>>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>

>>day we will once again be "in".
>>
>>Gene
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Kim](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 06:54:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I should add for clarity...

....obviously the sound measurement system of db is already logarithmic, but the underlying math in DAW's as I understand it is not. Obviously when you add a 20db sound to another identical 20db sound you don't get a 40db sound (you get 26db yes?) because the level measurement is logarithmic.

What I'm saying is that I'm pretty sure if you performed this experiment in the air, you would find that you got 25.999db, and that if you performed the same experiment, for arguments sake, at 120db, you'd get an even bigger drop, say 125.98db, or less.

DB is just our volume measurement system. The underlying maths in a DAW are straight linear maths, and I don't think they should be...

....assuming that you're trying to emulate the summing that takes place in air.

Cheers,
Kim.

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
>

>I think there's a degree of truth in the idea that people get set in the
>way something should sound and don't like change.

>

>I don't think I support the idea though that Protools' sound is superior,
 >and the future, and that Paris supporters are just set in their ways.

>

>Even if I was to accept that Protools is cleaner, clean isn't always better,
 >that's been well proven. If cleanest was always the best, we'd all plug
 guitars

>straight in to the desk, or the cleanest pre we had. We wouldn't want to
 >muddy up the sound by running through an amp, and then into a mic. I mean
 >that's just going to dirty the sound. That's an extreme and obvious example
 >of somewhere where a dirty sound is fairly universally considered superior.
 >Of course there are many guitars on records that are plugged straight in.
 >Sometimes it's what you want. Different strokes...

>

>I remember something Dave Stewart of the Eurythmics said back in the 80's.
 >He said "There are no bad sounds, just bad uses for sounds". He had all
 kinds

>of instruments, some keyboards as cheap as \$10 which made cheezy tinny crackly
 >sounds, but sometimes that's what you want.

>

>People like different sounds, and different production styles. They always
 >will. Are there Paris owners who only like Paris because it sounds "vintage"?
 >Probably. Is that wrong? No. How can it be wrong to like something because
 >it reminds you of something you enjoy?

>

>As per my other post, I'm not convinced that the air's natural summing bus
 >performs exact addition like that in Protools anyhow. Matter of fact I'm
 >almost certain it would not. Does that make Protools wrong? No, it makes
 >it a sound. It's a sound, to add to the many other options available for
 >making sound. It happens to be the sound that people are used to at the
 moment,

>and hence it's very popular.

>

>I imagine Protools is not much closer at emulating what happens in the air
 >than analog gear, or Paris. Most things in nature have logarithmic curves.
 >Like how the faster you drive the more air resistance you get. Like how
 the

>closer you get to the speed of light the more power it takes to go faster.
 >I'd say with some confidence that air pressure works the same. The higher
 >the pressure you want, the harder you'd have to push, and for double the
 >pressure, you'd need to press slightly more than twice as hard. Sound being
 >waves of pressure, this would give them a logarithmic curve. Adding together
 >two sounds of equal volume and you wont get double the volume, you'll get
 >99.9% more volume, because to create double the pressure takes more than
 >double the energy. Protools doesn't work like that. But it is a sound, and
 >many people like it, so good luck to them. I think saying that Protools,
 >or any sound, is "right" is dangerous.

>

>I don't think vintage plugs etc are holding anybody back. They're just options.
>They allow you to achieve a sound within the digital domain.
>
>I think the availability of different options is a great thing. What is most
>dangerous is anybody who claims that any system, old, new, or whatever, is
>superior in every way to any other system. Every system, and every sound,
>is superior to others in some ways, and inferior in others.
>
>The art form is in choosing the right sounds for the right moments. If the
>sound that you're after requires or benefits from a particular system, then
>use that system.
>
>Personally I'm still not a fan of the Protools sound. I'm not nearly as
against
>it as I used to be though. But I'd rather the sound of Paris, even if some
>consider it muddy.
>
>Cheers,
>Kim.
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Gene,
>>Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW "nostalgic"
>>sound thing.
>>
>>Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I watched
>>the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fidelity, newer
>sounding
>>DAW technology.
>>
>>The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who
ears
>>are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
>>
>>I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
>1982
>>as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
>The
>>sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking
>>"This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments
>>were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..
>>
>>In other works, where is the muddled drums? the muddy bass? the muddled
vocals

>>that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??

>>

>>Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic

>was

>>about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2

>>hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,

>>"Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha

>>ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..

>>

>>So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site priased

>>it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we lawed

>>every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm enough,

>>not dull , or muddy enough..

>>This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on every

>>forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as

well

>>as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless

they

>>has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ, Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,

>>Bomb factory)....

>>

>>So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys days

>>with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to make

>>your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make

>the

>>mixes sound like 1975!!!

>>

>>Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro Tools

>>HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail " RECORD-SOUND...

>>With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having

>NO

>>prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have

>the

>>High-Fedelity DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!

>>

>>Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and

>keep

>>driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every

>>now and then a product like Ozone's Izatope comes along (and others) that

>>challenge the old "muddy up the mix crowd).

>>

>>Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to

hear

>>that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..

>>

>>So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian Tankersly(I

>>adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to have

>>all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight DAW

>>companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market
>>segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
>>
>>For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
>state
>>of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris
>>is still in my rig, but I will no longer
>>fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund
>>with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.
>>Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice
>>wide -spacious,clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu converters.
>Let's
>>evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily
>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>>>
>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still sounds
>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
>>has
>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more aggressive
>>>when you push the gain stages.
>>>
>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
>>because
>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is
closer
>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
>>>
>>>
>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely
>a
>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>>
>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain unnamed),
>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big
>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
>>not
>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>>of
>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWS
>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more important

>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>>
>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
>>many
>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal music?
>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
>Labels
>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>>
>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I thought
>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at
>least
>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the realities
>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>>
>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself
>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made decisions
>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT
>sound".
>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>>
>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves
>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
>>of
>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and
>I
>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>>
>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some people
>>>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences
>>>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't
>>>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth fighting
>>>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>>

>one
>>>day we will once again be "in".
>>>
>>>Gene
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 07:10:04 GMT

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

One myth I would like to dispel is that Paris sounds muddy, vintage, analog or less detailed than PT's.

It's all in how hard you hit it.

Had a conversation with SSC years ago about using Paris for classical and he really ground on me hard to try it and compare it to Sonic Solutions. Sonic has always been the gold standard for classical, and honestly I thought he was full of it, but I tried it, using the same source material. He was right, it was actually better than Sonic on a 70-piece orchestra. Some of you have heard that CD. Did it sound "vintage" or muddy to you? Of course not, you just have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard and it works great for classical. An orchestra recorded with the just 2 of the best mics in the world (DPA / B&K) the best pre (no tubes please!) and a great convertor is the ultimate test for clarity. One little loss of anything and the whole thing turns to crap. It must be eq'ed and mastered to perfection, but if it is, it sounds like you are in the room with the orchestra.

Paris works extremely well on an orchestra and I can tell you that unless you push the levels the sound is as real, detailed, open and clear as I have ever heard.

Personally, I think Paris murders PT's on orchestras. The clarity and lack of distortion, even on the upper harmonics of high violin notes, is really better and the soundstage and imaging is terrific.

Try not hitting Paris so hard in the mixer, push the submix masters all the way up, and listen to the audio get nice and pristine.

DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 07:22:18 GMT

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

Of course not, you just have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard and it works great for classical.

That's the beauty of it. It works either way. There is an issue with the D/A converters and jitter when using the Paris clock, but with an external clock I've never thought it sounded anything other than what I wanted it to sound. Mixing conservatively yields a very pristine/accurate sounding

result.....however, this is blasphemy and I have to immediately jack the submix faders into the stratosphere so I can hear all that crappy distortion that I like.

;O)

"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote in message news:443f4acc\$1@linux...

>
> One myth I would like to dispel is that Paris sounds muddy, vintage,
> analog or less detailed than PT's.
>
> It's all in how hard you hit it.
>
> Had a conversation with SSC years ago about using Paris for
> classical and he really ground on me hard to try it and compare it to
> Sonic Solutions. Sonic has always been the gold standard for
> classical, and honestly I thought he was full of it, but I tried it, using
> the same source material. He was right, it was actually better than
> Sonic on a 70-piece orchestra. Some of you have heard that CD.
> Did it sound "vintage" or muddy to you? Of course not, you just
> have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
> and it works great for classical. An orchestra recorded with the
> just 2 of the best mics in the world (DPA / B&K) the best pre
> (no tubes please!) and a great convertor is the ultimate test for
> clarity. One little loss of anything and the whole thing turns to
> crap. It must be eq'ed and mastered to perfection, but if it is, it
> sounds like you are in the room with the orchestra.
>
> Paris works extremely well on an orchestra and I can tell you that
> unless you push the levels the sound is as real, detailed, open and
> clear as I have ever heard.
> Personally, I think Paris murders PT's on orchestras. The clarity
> and lack of distortion, even on the upper harmonics of high violin
> notes, is really better and the soundstage and imaging is terrific.
>
> Try not hitting Paris so hard in the mixer, push the submix masters
> all the way up, and listen to the audio get nice and pristine.
>
> DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [cujo](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 13:38:05 GMT

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

But you have "a sound" and by being a master of it, when an artist is looking

for that type of thing they will call you, I think that it would be sad if everyone did things the same way, (it seems to some people there is a right and wrong)

The different flavors are like a painter's pallet. I want this record to sound vintage and funky, or I want this one to be crystal clear.

That said, I am starting to think what LaMont says is true, I mean the low end was rolled off in the old days to prevent the needle from jumping right? Also, much of the mix compression was for the same thing? now everyone has subwoofers on their sub woofers! and digital handles a wide dynamic range, now, like you said, to get the mastering engineers to chill.

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>

>LaMont,

>I agree with much of what you said but not completely.

>I think you could apply the same logic to all aspects of the recordings arts.

sounds

>much cleaner than a 1176, but that does not mean that I would prefer the

>TLM170 or the GML 8900 in most cases.

>

>some of my preferences come from does not mean I have changed my mind. I

>I do however feel I will need to stay somewhat in tune with the current sound

>for any major market projects that I do in the future.

>

>A separate issue is what mastering engineers under the influence of A&R men

>are doing to records before they are released. Trend or not I think that >is criminal.

>

>So I recognize my own prejudices, I think I clearly see the new trends, but

>

>gene

>

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

>>
>>Gene,
>>Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW "nastalgic"
>>sound thing.
>>
>>Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I watched
>>the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer
>sounding
>>DAW technology.
>>
>>The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who
ears
>>are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.

>>
>>I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
>1982
>>as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
>The
>>sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking
>>"This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments
>>were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..
>>
>>In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled
vocals
>>that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
>>
>>Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
>was
>>about to occur!! Out comes the Putec(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2
>>hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
>>"Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha
>>ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
>>
>>So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site priased
>>it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we lawed
>>every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm enough,
>>not dull , or muddy enough..
>>This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on every
>>forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as
well
>>as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
they
>>has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ, Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
>>Bomb factory)....
>>
>>So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys days
>>with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to make

>>your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
>the
>>mixes sound like 1975!!!
>>
>>Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro Tools
>>HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail " RECORD-SOUND...
>>With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
>NO
>>prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have
>the
>>High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
>>
>>Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and
>keep
>>driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every
>>now and then a product like Ozone's Izatope comes along (and others) that
>>challenge the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
>>
>>Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to
hear
>>that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
>>
>>So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian Tankersly(I
>>adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to have
>>all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight DAW
>>companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market
>>segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
>>
>>For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
>state
>>of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris
>>is still in my rig, but I will no longer
>>fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund
>>with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.
>>Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice
>>wide -spacious,clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu converters.
>Let's
>>evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 13:45:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't think, or at least I hope, there won't be a continued trend for FM,
compressed radio and 64k mp3s to dictate sound. When I think of "outdated"

I think of limited bandwidth, sometimes noisy, and often mushy sound - not a recording style, or even mixing style necessarily, although it does change based on pop culture and available technology more than science.

A while back I read a bit on the history of recording. The overwhelming impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading the history of it, is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate what we hear as accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the way when engineers quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do that, someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy venture. Obviously there are creative requirements that eliminate accuracy (I once tried a binaural head test-analysis mic system on vocals - sucked, but it was incredibly accurate, which goes to show that not all we hear is as we would prefer to hear it).

Hence now we have, for example, kicks that sound nothing like the real thing - where you had a "koomphhh" or "doomphhh" to start with, the "standard" is to make it sound more like a "thmp" or "dhmp" (pardon my "technical" terminology). Gating, compression, EQ, even if not necessary to fix recording problems, have become a means to not just make the mix fit together, but alter the sound to what has become the radio standard. Much of it sounds great for what it is, but it isn't about accurate recording anymore, and that makes it hyper-dependant on popular trends rather than audiology.

Regards,
Dedric

On 4/13/06 11:53 PM, in article 443f38eb\$1@linux, "gene lennon"
<glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>
> So I recognize my own prejudices, I think I clearly see the new trends, but

>
> gene
>
> "LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>> Gene,
>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW "nastalgic"
>> sound thing.
>>
>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I watched
>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer
> sounding
>> DAW technology.

>>
>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old" guard Engineers who ears
>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
>>
>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
> 1982
>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
> The
>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking
>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments
>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..
>>
>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled vocals
>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
>>
>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
> was
>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2
>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha
>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
>>
>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site priased
>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we lawed
>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm enough,
>> not dull , or muddy enough..
>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wine,screemed, bitched, moaned on every
>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as well
>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless they
>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
>> Bomb factory)....
>>
>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys days
>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to make
>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
> the
>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
>>
>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro Tools
>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
>> RECORD-SOUND...
>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
> NO
>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have
> the
>> High-Fedeliy DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
>>

>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and
> keep
>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every
>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others) that
>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
>>
>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to hear
>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
>>
>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
>> Tankersly(I
>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to have
>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight DAW
>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market
>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
>>
>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
> state
>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris
>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund
>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.
>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice
>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters.
> Let's
>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 16:54:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dedric, once again, with a tear in my left eye-smile :) You have state what
I was going to say in response to my original post.
Thanks buddy...

"The overwhelming impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading
the history of it, is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate
what we hear as accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the
way when engineers
quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do that,
someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy venture."

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>I don't think, or at least I hope, there won't be a continued trend for

FM,

>compressed radio and 64k mp3s to dictate sound. When I think of "outdated"

>I think of limited bandwidth, sometimes noisy, and often mushy sound - not

a

>recording style, or even mixing style necessarily, although it does change

>based on pop culture and available technology more than science.

>

>A while back I read a bit on the history of recording. The overwhelming

>impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading the history of

it,

>is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate what we hear as

>accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the way when engineers

>quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do that,

>someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy

>venture. Obviously there are creative requirements that eliminate accuracy

>(I once tried a binaural head test-analysis mic system on vocals - sucked,

>but it was incredibly accurate, which goes to show that not all we hear

is

>as we would prefer to hear it).

>

>Hence now we have, for example, kicks that sound nothing like the real thing

>- where you had a "koomphhh" or "doomphhh" to start with, the "standard"

is

>to make it sound more like a "thmp" or "dhmp" (pardon my "technical"

>terminology). Gating, compression, EQ, even if not necessary to fix

>recording problems, have become a means to not just make the mix fit

>together, but alter the sound to what has become the radio standard. Much

>of it sounds great for what it is, but it isn't about accurate recording

>anymore, and that makes it hyper-dependant on popular trends rather than

>audiology.

>

>Regards,

>Dedric

>

>On 4/13/06 11:53 PM, in article 443f38eb\$1@linux, "gene lennon"

><glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>

>>

>> So I recognize my own prejudices, I think I clearly see the new trends,

but

now

>>

>> gene
>>
>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>> Gene,
>>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW "nastalgic"
>>> sound thing.
>>>
>>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I
watched
>>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer
>> sounding
>>> DAW technology.
>>>
>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who
ears
>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddied up recordings.
>>>
>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
>> 1982
>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
>> The
>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking
>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments
>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..
>>>
>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddied
vocals
>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
>>>
>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
>> was
>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Putec(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2
>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha
>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
>>>
>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site priased
>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we
lawed
>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
enough,
>>> not dull , or muddy enough..
>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on every
>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as
well
>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
they

>>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 >>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 >>> Bomb factory)....
 >>>
 >>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resources to reclaim the glory days
 >>> with the birth of the "Vintage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to
 make
 >>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, all in all..Make
 >> the
 >>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
 >>>
 >>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWs, being lead by Pro
 Tools
 >>> HD and Nuendo, Sonar there's a shift occurring in the "Holy-Grail "
 >>> RECORD-SOUND...
 >>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
 >> NO
 >>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get the 1975" sound, we have
 >> the
 >>> High-Fidelity DAW sound in all its glory!! ..Yipee!!
 >>>
 >>> Still, the old guard continues to hold its thumb on the DAW market and
 >> keep
 >>> driving manufacturers to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every
 >>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others)
 that
 >>> challenge the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 >>>
 >>> Today kids are brought on the Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to
 hear
 >>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 >>>
 >>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 >>> Tankersly(I
 >>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vintage engineers) will continue to push to
 have
 >>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
 DAW
 >>> companies to fix summing buses or even new a new summing buss market
 >>> segment to ensure they get the 1975 sound with today's DAW.
 >>>
 >>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the current
 >> state
 >>> of very high fidelity that's afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris
 >>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
 >>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightsound
 >>> with bottom..So be it..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.

>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice
>>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters.
>> Let's
>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 16:58:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think it's great that we don't have to deal with some of the issues that made recording such a chore and required such a number of tools to deal with, but I'm not nearly as convinced as you guys that *accurate is better*. Listen to the Dixie Chicks first CD that was recorded to tape and then subsequent ones that were recorded to digital. The latter fefforts sound great, but they don't sound as pleasing to my ear as the first one. The remix of Hotel California is another example of digital awfulness. It's very accurate and sounds like pure crap, IMO.....and it was originally recorded to tape and then PT'ed. Sorry, but it doee sound terrible compared to the original to my ears. With all of the new nice shiny tools we have available today, it's possible to hear *more* as far as dugital ugliness is concerned as well. Analog gear and tape provides glue. Lots of stuff falls apart without glue.

Deej

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:443fd3ca\$1@linux...

>
> Dedric, once again, with a tear in my left eye-smile :) You have state what
> I was going to say in response to my original post.
> Thanks buddy...
>
> "The overwhelming impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading
> the history of it, is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate
> what we hear as accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the
> way when engineers
> quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do that,
> someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy venture."
>
>
>
>

>
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
> >I don't think, or at least I hope, there won't be a continued trend for
> FM,
> >compressed radio and 64k mp3s to dictate sound. When I think of
"outdated"
> >I think of limited bandwidth, sometimes noisy, and often mushy sound -
not
> a
> >recording style, or even mixing style necessarily, although it does
change
> >based on pop culture and available technology more than science.
> >
> >A while back I read a bit on the history of recording. The overwhelming
> >impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading the history of
> it,
> >is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate what we hear as
> >accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the way when
engineers
> >quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do
that,
> >someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy
> >venture. Obviously there are creative requirements that eliminate
accuracy
> >(I once tried a binaural head test-analysis mic system on vocals -
sucked,
> >but it was incredibly accurate, which goes to show that not all we hear
> is
> >as we would prefer to hear it).
> >
> >Hence now we have, for example, kicks that sound nothing like the real
think
> >- where you had a "koomphhh" or "doomphhh" to start with, the "standard"
> is
> >to make it sound more like a "thmp" or "dhmp" (pardon my "technical"
> >terminology). Gating, compression, EQ, even if not necessary to fix
> >recording problems, have become a means to not just make the mix fit
> >together, but alter the sound to what has become the radio standard.
Much
> >of it sounds great for what it is, but it isn't about accurate recording
> >anymore, and that makes it hyper-dependant on popular trends rather than
> >audiology.
> >
> >Regards,
> >Dedric
> >
> >On 4/13/06 11:53 PM, in article 443f38eb\$1@linux, "gene lennon"

> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

> >

> >>

> >> So I recognize my own prejudices, I think I clearly see the new trends,

> but

> >> I don't prefer the new sound. I have no doubt that for many listeners

> now

> >> and most in the future I will be from "The school of the outdated sound."

> >>

> >> gene

> >>

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

> >>>

> >>> Gene,

> >>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW "nastalgic"

> >>> sound thing.

> >>>

> >>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I

> watched

> >>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer

> >> sounding

> >>> DAW technology.

> >>>

> >>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who

> ears

> >>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddied up recordings.

> >>>

> >>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year

> >> 1982

> >>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..

> >> The

> >>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking

> >>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments

> >>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..

> >>>

> >>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddied

> vocals

> >>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??

> >>>

> >>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the

magic

> >> was

> >>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2

> >>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,

> >>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha

> >>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..

> >>>

> >>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site priased

> >>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we

> lawed

> >>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm

> enough,

> >>> not dull , or muddy enough..

> >>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on every

> >>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as

> well

> >>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless

> they

> >>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,

> >>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,

> >>> Bomb factory)....

> >>>

> >>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys

> days

> >>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to

> make

> >>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make

> >> the

> >>> mixes sound like 1975!!!

> >>>

> >>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro

> Tools

> >>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "

> >>> RECORD-SOUND...

> >>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having

> >> NO

> >>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have

> >> the

> >>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!

> >>>

> >>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market
and
> >> keep
> >>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
every
> >>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others)
> that
> >>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
> >>>
> >>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to
> hear
> >>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
> >>>
> >>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
> >>> Tankersly(I
> >>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to
> have
> >>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
> DAW
> >>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss
market
> >>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
> >>>
> >>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the
cureent
> >> state
> >>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,
Paris
> >>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
> >>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and
Brightosund
> >>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192
converters.
> >>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's
nice
> >>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu
converters.
> >> Let's
> >>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
> >>>
> >>
> >
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [JD](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 17:29:08 GMT

Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than Paris stuff again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're all being goaded and bated here.

This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough diversity in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach to everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much trouble, five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for very long. Just because a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void. There should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the followers, and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would be more boring than they already are!

The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you turn 26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old??? How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck, this music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is unacceptable! No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be acceptable! But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!

LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your sure to end up in the same place!

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>Good post, LaMont

>

>--

>Martin Harrington

>www.lendanear-sound.com

>

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...

>>

>> Gene,

>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW

>> "nostalgic"

>> sound thing.

>>

>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I

>> watched

>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer

>> sounding

>> DAW technology.

>>

>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who

>> ears
>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
>>
>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year

>> 1982
>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..

>> The
>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking
>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments
>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..
>>
>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled

>> vocals
>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
>>
>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic

>> was
>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2
>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha
>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
>>
>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PAris. The pro Engineers on this site priased
>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we

>> lawed
>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm

>> enough,
>> not dull , or muddy enough..
>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on every
>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protocols) mix was bad as

>> well
>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless

>> they
>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
>> Bomb factory)....
>>
>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
days

>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to make
>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make

>> the
>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
>>
>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro

>> Tools
>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
>> RECORD-SOUND...
>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
NO
>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have

>> the
>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
>>
>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and

>> keep
>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every
>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others) that
>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
>>
>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to

>> hear
>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
>>
>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
>> Tankersly(I
>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to have
>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
DAW
>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market
>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
>>
>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent

>> state
>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris
>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund
>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.
>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice
>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters.

>> Let's
>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily
>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>>>
>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still
>>>sounds
>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
>> has
>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more
>>>aggressive
>>>when you push the gain stages.
>>>
>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
>> because
>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is

>>>closer
>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
>>>
>>>
>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely
a
>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>>
>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
>>>unnamed),
>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big
>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
>> not
>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>> of
>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWS
>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
>>>important
>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>>
>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
>> many
>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal

>>>music?
>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.

>>>Labels
>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>>
>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I
>>>thought
>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at

>>>least
>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
>>>realities
>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>>
>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself
>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made
>>>decisions
>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT

>>>sound".
>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>>
>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves
>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
>> of
>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and
I
>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>>
>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some people
>>>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences
>>>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't
>>>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
>>>fighting
>>>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>>

one
>>>day we will once again be "in".
>>>
>>>Gene
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [JD](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 17:35:37 GMT

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

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

>I think it's great that we don't have to deal with some of the issues that
>made recording such a chore and required such a number of tools to deal
>with, but I'm not nearly as convinced as you guys that *accurate is better*.
>Listen to the Dixie Chicks first CD that was recorded to tape and then
>subsequent ones that were recorded to digital. The latter fefforts sound
>great, but they don't sound as pleasing to my ear as the first one. The
>remix of Hotel California is another example of digital awfulness. It's
very
>accurate and sounds like pure crap, IMO.....and it was originally recorded
>to tape and then PT'ed. Sorry, but it doee sound terrible compared to the
>original to my ears. With all of the new nice shiny tools we have available
>today, it's possible to hear *more* as far as dugital ugliness is concerned
>as well. Analog gear and tape provides glue. Lots of stuff falls apart
>without glue.
>
>Deej

Deej, your right as usual!

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:443fd3ca\$1@linux...
>>

>> Dedric, once again, with a tear in my left eye-smile :) You have state
>what
>> I was going to say in response to my original post.
>> Thanks buddy...
>>
>> "The overwhelming impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading
>> the history of it, is that the goal of recording has always been to
>recreate
>> what we hear as accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along
the
>> way when engineers
>> quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do
>that,
>> someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy
>venture."

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

>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>> >I don't think, or at least I hope, there won't be a continued trend for
>> FM,
>> >compressed radio and 64k mp3s to dictate sound. When I think of
>"outdated"
>> >I think of limited bandwidth, sometimes noisy, and often mushy sound
-
>not
>> a
>> >recording style, or even mixing style necessarily, although it does
>change
>> >based on pop culture and available technology more than science.
>> >
>> >A while back I read a bit on the history of recording. The overwhelming
>> >impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading the history
>of
>> it,
>> >is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate what we hear
>as
>> >accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the way when
>engineers
>> >quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do
>that,
>> >someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy
>> >venture. Obviously there are creative requirements that eliminate
>accuracy
>> >(I once tried a binaural head test-analysis mic system on vocals -
>sucked,
>> >but it was incredibly accurate, which goes to show that not all we hear
>> is
>> >as we would prefer to hear it).
>> >
>> >Hence now we have, for example, kicks that sound nothing like the real
>think
>> >- where you had a "koomphhh" or "doomphhh" to start with, the "standard"
>> is
>> >to make it sound more like a "thmp" or "dhmp" (pardon my "technical"
>> >terminology). Gating, compression, EQ, even if not necessary to fix
>> >recording problems, have become a means to not just make the mix fit
>> >together, but alter the sound to what has become the radio standard.
>Much
>> >of it sounds great for what it is, but it isn't about accurate recording
>> >anymore, and that makes it hyper-dependant on popular trends rather than
>> >audiology.
>> >
>> >Regards,
>> >Dedric
>> >
>> >On 4/13/06 11:53 PM, in article 443f38eb\$1@linux, "gene lennon"

>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >>
>> >> So I recognize my own prejudices, I think I clearly see the new trends,
>> but
>> >> I don't prefer the new sound. I have no doubt that for many listeners
>> now
>> >> and most in the future I will be from "The school of the outdated
>sound."
>> >>
>> >> gene
>> >>
>> >> "LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>> Gene,
>> >>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW
>"nostalgic"
>> >>> sound thing.
>> >>>
>> >>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as
I
>> watched
>> >>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity,
>newer
>> >> sounding
>> >>> DAW technology.
>> >>>
>> >>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers
who
>> ears
>> >>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
>> >>>
>> >>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The
>year
>> >> 1982
>> >>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI
>mixer..Fine..
>> >> The
>> >>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
>thinking
>> >>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
>instruments
>> >>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
>sound..
>> >>>
>> >>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled
>> vocals
>> >>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??

>> >>>
 >> >>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the
 >magic
 >> >> was
 >> >>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
 >DBX160..2
 >> >>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng
 >again,
 >> >>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,
 >witha
 >> >>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 >> >>>
 >> >>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site
 >priased
 >> >>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND,
 we
 >> lawed
 >> >>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
 >> enough,
 >> >>> not dull , or muddy enough..
 >> >>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on
 >every
 >> >>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad
 as
 >> well
 >> >>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
 >> they
 >> >>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 >> >>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 >> >>> Bomb factory)....
 >> >>>
 >> >>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
 >> days
 >> >>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is)
 to
 >> make
 >> >>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in
 >all..Make
 >> >> the
 >> >>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
 >> >>>
 >> >>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by
 Pro
 >> Tools
 >> >>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
 >> >>> RECORD-SOUND...
 >> >>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today
 >having

>> >> NO
 >> >>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we
 >have
 >> >> the
 >> >>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
 >> >>>
 >> >>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market
 >and
 >> >> keep
 >> >>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
 >every
 >> >>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others)
 >> that
 >> >>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 >> >>>
 >> >>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect
 to
 >> hear
 >> >>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 >> >>>
 >> >>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 >> >>> Tankersly(I
 >> >>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push
 to
 >> have
 >> >>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
 >> DAW
 >> >>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss
 >market
 >> >>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
 >> >>>
 >> >>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the
 >cureent
 >> >> state
 >> >>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,
 >Paris
 >> >>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
 >> >>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and
 >Brightosund
 >> >>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192
 >converters.
 >> >>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's
 >nice
 >> >>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu
 >converters.
 >> >> Let's
 >> >>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
 >> >>>

>> >>
>> >
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 17:55:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach is better than another.

On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our preferences, and the fact that currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available 40, 30, 20 and even 10 years ago.

Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing, and the concept of creating listener appeal in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't anything wrong with that, but recording has always been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It isn't a platform war, and never was - just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the budgets we have available.

I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring system. It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure, but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a 4-track cassette deck if that's what floats your boat creatively.

Regards,
Dedric

"JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote in message news:443fdb4\$1@linux...

>
> Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than Paris
> stuff
> again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're
> all
> being goaded and bated here.
>
> This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough
> diversity

> in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach to
 > everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much
 > trouble,
 > five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for vary long. Just
 > because
 > a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void.
 > There
 > should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the
 > followers,
 > and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would be
 > more
 > boring than they already are!
 >
 > The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you turn
 > 26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old???
 > How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck,
 > this
 > music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is
 > unacceptable!
 > No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety
 > is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be
 > acceptable!
 > But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!
 >
 > LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your
 > sure
 > to end up in the same place!
 >
 >
 > "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
 >>Good post, LaMont
 >>
 >>--
 >>Martin Harrington
 >>www.lendanear-sound.com
 >>
 >>"LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...
 >>>
 >>> Gene,
 >>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW
 >>> "nastalgic"
 >>> sound thing.
 >>>
 >>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I
 >>> watched
 >>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer
 >
 >>> sounding

>>> DAW technology.
>>>
>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who
>
>>> ears
>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
>>>
>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
>
>>> 1982
>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
>
>>> The
>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
>>> thinking
>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
>>> instruments
>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
>>> sound..
>>>
>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled
>
>>> vocals
>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
>>>
>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
>
>>> was
>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Putec(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
>>> DBX160..2
>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,
>>> witha
>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
>>>
>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site
>>> priased
>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we
>
>>> lawed
>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
>
>>> enough,
>>> not dull , or muddy enough..
>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wine,d,screemed, bitched, moaned on
>>> every
>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as
>

>>> well
>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
>
>>> they
>>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
>>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
>>> Bomb factory)....
>>>
>>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
> days
>>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to
>>> make
>>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
>
>>> the
>>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
>>>
>>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro
>
>>> Tools
>>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
>>> RECORD-SOUND...
>>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
> NO
>>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have
>
>>> the
>>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
>>>
>>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and
>
>>> keep
>>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
>>> every
>>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izatope comes along (and others)
>>> that
>>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
>>>
>>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to
>
>>> hear
>>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
>>>
>>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
>>> Tankersly(I
>>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to
>>> have
>>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight

> DAW

>>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market

>>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.

>>>

>>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent

>

>>> state

>>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris

>>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer

>>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund

>>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192

>>> converters.

>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice

>>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters.

>

>>> Let's

>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time

>>>>primarily

>>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.

>>>>

>>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still

>>>>sounds

>>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still

>>> has

>>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more

>>>>aggressive

>>>>when you push the gain stages.

>>>>

>>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS

>>> because

>>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is

>

>>>>closer

>>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely

> a

>>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.

>>>>

>>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
>>>>unnamed),
>>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big
>>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
>>> not
>>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>>> of
>>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWs
>>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
>>>>important
>>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
>>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>>>
>>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
>>> many
>>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal
>>>>music?
>>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
>
>>>>Labels
>>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>>>
>>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I
>>>>thought
>>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at
>
>>>>least
>>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
>>>>realities
>>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>>>
>>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee
>>>>myself
>>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made
>>>>decisions
>>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more
>>>>trendy
>>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT
>
>>>>sound".
>>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>>>
>>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the
>>>>Waves
>>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
>>> of
>>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and

> I
>>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>>>
>>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some
>>>> people
>>>>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own
>>>>preferences
>>>>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I
>>>>don't
>>>>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
>>>>fighting
>>>>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>>>
>>>>And don't forget.the cyclical nature of fashion almost guarantees that
> one
>>>>day we will once again be "in".
>>>>
>>>>Gene
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [EK Sound](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 18:15:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What kills me is the industry types that won't record with you if you don't have PT... "Hmmm... your studio can't be all that good if you don't have ProTools..." What you are using is of little consequence IMHO.

David.

Dedric Terry wrote:

> I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach is
> better than another.
> On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our
> preferences, and the fact that
> currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available 40,
> 30, 20 and even 10 years ago.
> Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing, and
> the concept of creating listener appeal
> in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't
> anything wrong with that, but recording has always
> been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It isn't
> a platform war, and never was -
> just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the

> budgets we have available.
>
> I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring system.
> It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure,
> but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what
> entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit
> from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a 4-track
> cassette deck if that's what floats your
> boat creatively.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [JD](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 18:43:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry, I don't see this post as simply an observation, discussion or even just a opinion. LaMont is saying that the old analog,tape saturated, edgy, overdriven sound is no longer valid. That we should all get over it and move on. That the Paris signature sound is no longer in, that the new PT, Nuendo sound is where it's at. Once again, he is saying PT/Nuendo sounds better than Paris. I feel this is a baste job.

Sure audio equipment has evolved. Newer doesn't always mean better. A combination of all tools is the smartest route. I don't think a whole sound should be eliminated just because something is currently trendy. He clearly states he thinks that, that sound is done and we should all move on the new PT sound.

He can say what ever he wants, I'm just calling it like I see it.

Here is LaMont's chance to clarify!

"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:

>I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach is

>better than another.
>On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our
>preferences, and the fact that
>currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available
40,
>30, 20 and even 10 years ago.
>Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing, and

>the concept of creating listener appeal
>in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't

>anything wrong with that, but recording has always
>been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It isn't

>a platform war, and never was -
>just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the

>budgets we have available.
>
>I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring system.

>It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure,
>but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what
>entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit
>from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a 4-track

>cassette deck if that's what floats your
>boat creatively.
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>
>"JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote in message news:443fdbe4\$1@linux...
>>
>> Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than Paris

>> stuff
>> again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're

>> all
>> being goaded and bated here.
>>
>> This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough
>> diversity
>> in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach
to
>> everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much

>> trouble,
>> five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for vary long. Just

>> because
>> a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void.

>> There
>> should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the
>> followers,
>> and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would be

>> more
>> boring than they already are!
>>
>> The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you
turn
>> 26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old???
>> How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck,

>> this
>> music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is
>> unacceptable!
>> No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety
>> is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be

>> acceptable!
>> But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!
>>
>> LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your

>> sure
>> to end up in the same place!
>>
>>
>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>>> Good post, LaMont
>>>
>>>--
>>> Martin Harrington
>>> www.lendaneer-sound.com
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Gene,
>>>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW
>>>> "nostalgic"
>>>> sound thing.
>>>>
>>>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I
>>>> watched
>>>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer
>>
>>>> sounding
>>>> DAW technology.

>>>>
 >>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old" guard Engineers who
 >>
 >>>> ears
 >>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
 >>>>
 >>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
 >>
 >>>> 1982
 >>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
 >>
 >>>> The
 >>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
 >>>> thinking
 >>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
 >>>> instruments
 >>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
 >>>> sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled
 >>
 >>>> vocals
 >>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
 >>>>
 >>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
 >>
 >>>> was
 >>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
 >>>> DBX160..2
 >>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
 >>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,

 >>>> witha
 >>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site
 >>>> priased
 >>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we
 >>
 >>>> lawed
 >>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
 >>
 >>>> enough,
 >>>> not dull , or muddy enough..
 >>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on

 >>>> every
 >>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad

as
>>
>>>> well
>>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
>>
>>>> they
>>>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
>>>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
>>>> Bomb factory)....
>>>>
>>>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
>> days
>>>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to

>>>> make
>>>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
>>
>>>> the
>>>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
>>>>
>>>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro
>>
>>>> Tools
>>>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
>>>> RECORD-SOUND...
>>>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
>> NO
>>>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have
>>
>>>> the
>>>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
>>>>
>>>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market
and
>>
>>>> keep
>>>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,

>>>> every
>>>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izatope comes along (and others)

>>>> that
>>>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
>>>>
>>>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect
to
>>
>>>> hear

>>>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..

>>>>

>>>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian

>>>> Tankersly(I

>>>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to

>>>> have

>>>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight

>> DAW

>>>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market

>>>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.

>>>>

>>>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent

>>

>>>> state

>>>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris

>>>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer

>>>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund

>>>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192

>>>> converters.

>>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's

nice

>>>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters.

>>

>>>> Let's

>>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time

>>>>>primarily

>>>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.

>>>>>

>>>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still

>>>>>sounds

>>>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still

>>>> has

>>>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more

>>>>>aggressive

>>>>>when you push the gain stages.

>>>>>

>>>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS

>>>> because

>>>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is

>>
>>>>>closer
>>>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely
>> a
>>>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>>>>
>>>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
>>>>>unnamed),
>>>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was
big
>>>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good
and
>>>> not
>>>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>>>> of
>>>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding
DAWS
>>>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
>>>>>important
>>>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
>>>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>>>>
>>>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias.
How
>>>> many
>>>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal
>>>>>music?
>>>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
>>
>>>>>Labels
>>>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>>>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>>>>
>>>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I
>>>>>thought
>>>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has
at
>>
>>>>>least
>>>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
>>>>>realities
>>>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>>>>
>>>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee

Hi All,

I am a former Paris user who still use Paris now and then, especially when I remix old songs recorded in Paris. I gave up in favour of Soundscape which I truly love.

when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left to desire. It nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT, Soundscape, Nuendo, Samplitude etc.

I have a fairly large Paris setup and as much magic as it has it is quite unreliable compared to the other systems. For example: Paris can sometimes (randomly) add strange DC offset to the files. It can depending on heat cause clicks. Aux leakage. Just to mention

what is by some perceived as warmth, sounds to me like a bit clouded midrange. I have recorded a fair amount of classical choirs in both Paris, Soundscape and Nuendo. In this genre there is simply no competition at all. My Soundscape converters (Apogee) simply kills Paris in clarity and detail. OTOH with pop/rock, especially acoustic pop/rock (live drums), Paris can sound a bit more exciting than the others.

Last but not least, sound aside Paris is a dinosaur. The routing options leave A LOT to desire. The I/O flexibility is back to the stone age compared to newer systems. The non-sample accurate editing is a PITA. Lack of professional I/O options. Very rudimentary handling of native plugins, especially in stereo. No bussing possibilities. No VST/DX on master bus. No delay compensation. etc. etc...

IMHO most people who are sticking to Paris are doing it for financial reasons. Given the very low price the SH systems are going for, the price vs. sound performance ratio is amazing, compared to other DSP-based system. In a true professional environment with clients hanging over your shoulder, the compromises are just too big, all IMO of course.

Just my 2 cents.

Babu

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

>Of course not, you just

>have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard

>and it works great for classical.

>

>That's the beauty of it. It works either way. There is an issue with the

D/A

>converters and jitter when using the Paris clock, but with an external clock
>I've never thought it sounded anything other than what I wanted it to sound.
>result.....however, this is blasphemy and I have to immediately jack the
>submix faders into the stratosphere so I can hear all that crappy distortion
>that I like.
>
>;O)
>
>
>
>
>"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote in message news:443f4acc\$1@linux...
>>
>> One myth I would like to dispel is that Paris sounds muddy, vintage,
>> analog or less detailed than PT's.
>>
>> It's all in how hard you hit it.
>>
>> Had a conversation with SSC years ago about using Paris for
>> classical and he really ground on me hard to try it and compare it to
>> Sonic Solutions. Sonic has always been the gold standard for
>> classical, and honestly I thought he was full of it, but I tried it, using
>> the same source material. He was right, it was actually better than
>> Sonic on a 70-piece orchestra. Some of you have heard that CD.
>> Did it sound "vintage" or muddy to you? Of course not, you just
>> have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
>> and it works great for classical. An orchestra recorded with the
>> just 2 of the best mics in the world (DPA / B&K) the best pre
>> (no tubes please!) and a great convertor is the ultimate test for
>> clarity. One little loss of anything and the whole thing turns to
>> crap. It must be eq'ed and mastered to perfection, but if it is, it
>> sounds like you are in the room with the orchestra.
>>
>> Paris works extremely well on an orchestra and I can tell you that
>> unless you push the levels the sound is as real, detailed, open and
>> clear as I have ever heard.
>> Personally, I think Paris murders PT's on orchestras. The clarity
>> and lack of distortion, even on the upper harmonics of high violin
>> notes, is really better and the soundstage and imaging is terrific.
>>
>> Try not hitting Paris so hard in the mixer, push the submix masters
>> all the way up, and listen to the audio get nice and pristine.
>>
>> DC
>
>

I track with Paris with folks looking over my shoulder all the time. It's a matter of knowing what to do and how to do it. My system is very stable.

As far as financial concerns go, yes, I stick with Paris because of financial concerns. If I had the money, there is not doubt at all that I'd be tracking to a pair of synced 2" 16 track machines and an API legacy console.

Different strokes ;o)

Deej

"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote in message news:443ff4c0\$1@linux...

>

> Hi All,

>

> I am a former Paris user who still use Paris now and then, especially when

> I remix old songs recorded in Paris. I gave up in favour of Soundscape which

> I truly love.

>

> when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left to desire. It

> nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT, Soundscape,

> Nuendo, Samplitude etc.

>

> I have a fairly large Paris setup and as much magic as it has it is quite

> unreliable compared to the other systems.

> For example: Paris can sometimes (randomly) add strange DC offset to the

> files. It can depending on heat cause clicks. Aux leakage. Just to mention

Also,

> what is by some perceived as warmth, sounds to me like a bit clouded midrange.

> I have recorded a fair amount of classical choirs in both Paris, Soundscape

> and Nuendo. In this genre there is simply no competition at all. My

Soundscape

> converters (Apogee) simply kills Paris in clarity and detail. OTOH with pop/rock,

> especially acoustic pop/rock (live drums), Paris can sound a bit more exciting

> than the others.

>

> Last but not least, sound aside Paris is a dinosaur. The routing options

> leave A LOT to desire. The I/O flexibility is back to the stone age

compared

- > to newer systems. The non-sample accurate editing is a PITA. Lack of professional
- > I/O options. Very rudimentary handling of native plugins, especially in stereo.
- > No bussing possibilities. No VST/DX on master bus. No delay compensation.
- > etc. ect...

>

- > IMHO most people who are sticking to Paris are doing it for financial reasons.

- > Given the very low price the SH systems are going for, the price vs. sound
- > performance ratio is amazing, compared to other DSP-based system. In a true

- > professional environment with clients hanging over your shoulder, the compromises

- > are just too big, all IMO of course.

>

- > Just my 2 cents.

>

- > Babu

>

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

- > >Of course not, you just

- > >have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard

- > >and it works great for classical.

> >

- > >That's the beauty of it. It works either way. There is an issue with the
- > D/A

- > >converters and jitter when using the Paris clock, but with an external clock

- > >I've never thought it sounded anything other than what I wanted it to sound.

- > >result.....however, this is blasphemy and I have to immediately jack the

- > >submix faders into the stratosphere so I can hear all that crappy distortion

- > >that I like.

> >

- > >;O)

> >

> >

> >

- > >"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote in message news:443f4acc\$1@linux...

> >>

- > >> One myth I would like to dispel is that Paris sounds muddy, vintage,

- > >> analog or less detailed than PT's.

> >>

- > >> It's all in how hard you hit it.

> >>

> >> Had a conversation with SSC years ago about using Paris for
> >> classical and he really ground on me hard to try it and compare it to
> >> Sonic Solutions. Sonic has always been the gold standard for
> >> classical, and honestly I thought he was full of it, but I tried it,
using
> >> the same source material. He was right, it was actually better than
> >> Sonic on a 70-piece orchestra. Some of you have heard that CD.
> >> Did it sound "vintage" or muddy to you? Of course not, you just
> >> have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
> >> and it works great for classical. An orchestra recorded with the
> >> just 2 of the best mics in the world (DPA / B&K) the best pre
> >> (no tubes please!) and a great convertor is the ultimate test for
> >> clarity. One little loss of anything and the whole thing turns to
> >> crap. It must be eq'ed and mastered to perfection, but if it is, it
> >> sounds like you are in the room with the orchestra.
> >>
> >> Paris works extremely well on an orchestra and I can tell you that
> >> unless you push the levels the sound is as real, detailed, open and
> >> clear as I have ever heard.
> >> Personally, I think Paris murders PT's on orchestras. The clarity
> >> and lack of distortion, even on the upper harmonics of high violin
> >> notes, is really better and the soundstage and imaging is terrific.
> >>
> >> Try not hitting Paris so hard in the mixer, push the submix masters
> >> all the way up, and listen to the audio get nice and pristine.
> >>
> >> DC
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:17:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello,
LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your sure
to end up in the same place!

I am an PT HD3 owner and a 5 card Paris owner since 1997. I don't know if
that last statement was insult or not??

If so, then you are as ignorant as you sound on this thread..
LaMont

"JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote:

>

>Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than Paris stuff

>again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're all

>being goaded and bated here.

>

>This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough diversity

>in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach to

>everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much trouble,

>five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for very long. Just because

>a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void.

There

>should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the followers,

>and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would be more

>boring than they already are!

>

>The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you turn

>26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old???

> How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck, this

>music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is unacceptable!

> No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety

>is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be acceptable!

> But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!

>

>LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your sure

>to end up in the same place!

>

>

>"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>>Good post, LaMont

>>

>>--

>>Martin Harrington

>>www.lendanear-sound.com

>>

>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> Gene,

>>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW

>>> "nostalgic"

>>> sound thing.

>>>

>>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I

>>> watched

>>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer

>

>>> sounding

>>> DAW technology.

>>>

>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who

>

>>> ears

>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddied up recordings.

>>>

>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year

>

>>> 1982

>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..

>

>>> The

>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember thinking

>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other instruments

>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record sound..

>>>

>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddied

>

>>> vocals

>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??

>>>

>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic

>

>>> was

>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes, DBX160..2

>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,

>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open, witha

>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..

>>>

>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site priased

>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we

>

>>> lawed

>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm

>

>>> enough,

>>> not dull , or muddy enough..

>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wine,screemed, bitched, moaned on every

>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as

>

>>> well

>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
 >
 >>> they
 >>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 >>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 >>> Bomb factory)....
 >>>
 >>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
 >days
 >>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to
 make
 >>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
 >
 >>> the
 >>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
 >>>
 >>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro
 >
 >>> Tools
 >>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
 >>> RECORD-SOUND...
 >>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
 >NO
 >>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have
 >
 >>> the
 >>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
 >>>
 >>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and
 >
 >>> keep
 >>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But, every
 >>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izatope comes along (and others)
 that
 >>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 >>>
 >>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to
 >
 >>> hear
 >>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 >>>
 >>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 >>> Tankersly(I
 >>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to
 have
 >>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
 >DAW
 >>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market

>>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with today's DAW.

>>>

>>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
>

>>> state

>>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes, Paris

>>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer

>>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund

>>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192 converters.

>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's nice

>>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu converters.

>

>>> Let's

>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily

>>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.

>>>>

>>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still

>>>>sounds

>>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still

>>> has

>>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more

>>>>aggressive

>>>>when you push the gain stages.

>>>>

>>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS

>>> because

>>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is

>

>>>>closer

>>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely

>a

>>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.

>>>>

>>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain

>>>>unnamed),

>>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was
big
>>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
>>> not
>>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>>> of
>>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWs
>>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
>>>>important
>>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of about
>>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>>>
>>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
>>> many
>>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal

>>>>music?
>>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
>
>>>>Labels
>>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>>>
>>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I
>>>>thought
>>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at
>
>>>>least
>>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
>>>>realities
>>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>>>
>>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee myself
>>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made
>>>>decisions
>>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
>>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT
>
>>>>sound".
>>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>>>
>>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves
>>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
>>> of
>>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and
>I
>>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>>>

>>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some people
>>>> may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences
>>>> are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I
don't
>>>> see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
>>>> fighting
>>>> over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>>>

>one
>>>> day we will once again be "in".
>>>>
>>>> Gene
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Reality check
Posted by [JD](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:19:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> I track with Paris with folks looking over my shoulder all the time. It's
> a matter of knowing what to do and how to do it. My system is very stable.
>
> As far as financial concerns go, yes, I stick with Paris because of
> financial concerns. If I had the money, there is not doubt at all that I'd
> be tracking to a pair of synced 2" 16 track machines and an API legacy
> console.
>
> Different strokes ;o)
>
> Deej

Deej, you are so 1975 in your thinking! LOL

> "Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote in message news:443ff4c0\$1@linux...
>>
>> Hi All,
>>
>> I am a former Paris user who still use Paris now and then, especially
when
>> I remix old songs recorded in Paris. I gave up in favour of Soundscape
> which
>> I truly love.
>>

>> when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left to desire.
It
>> nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT,
>Soundscape,
>> Nuendo, Samplitude etc.
>>
>> I have a fairly large Paris setup and as much magic as it has it is quite
>> unreliable compared to the other systems.
>> For example: Paris can sometimes (randomly) add strange DC offset to the
>> files. It can depend on heat cause clicks. Aux leakage. Just to mention

>Also,
>> what is by some perceived as warmth, sounds to me like a bit clouded
>midrange.
>> I have recorded a fair amount of classical choirs in both Paris, Soundscape
>> and Nuendo. In this genre there is simply no competition at all. My
>Soundscape
>> converters (Apogee) simply kills Paris in clarity and detail. OTOH with
>pop/rock,
>> especially acoustic pop/rock (live drums), Paris can sound a bit more
>exciting
>> than the others.
>>
>> Last but not least, sound aside Paris is a dinosaur. The routing options
>> leave A LOT to desire. The I/O flexibility is back to the stone age
>compared
>> to newer systems. The non-sample accurate editing is a PITA. Lack of
>professional
>> I/O options. Very rudimentary handling of native plugins, especially in
>stereo.
>> No bussing possibilities. No VST/DX on master bus. No delay compensation.
>> etc. ect...
>>
>> IMHO most people who are sticking to Paris are doing it for financial
>reasons.
>> Given the very low price the SH systems are going for, the price vs. sound
>> performance ratio is amazing, compared to other DSP-based system. In a
>true
>> professional environment with clients hanging over your shoulder, the
>compromises
>> are just too big, all IMO of course.
>>
>> Just my 2 cents.
>>
>> Babu
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>> >Of course not, you just
>> >have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
>> >and it works great for classical.
>> >
>> >That's the beauty of it. It works either way. There is an issue with
the
>> D/A
>> >converters and jitter when using the Paris clock, but with an external
>clock
>> >I've never thought it sounded anything other than what I wanted it to
>sound.
>> >result.....however, this is blasphemy and I have to immediately jack
the
>> >submix faders into the stratosphere so I can hear all that crappy
>distortion
>> >that I like.
>> >
>> >;O)
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote in message news:443f4acc\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> One myth I would like to dispel is that Paris sounds muddy, vintage,
>> >> analog or less detailed than PT's.
>> >>
>> >> It's all in how hard you hit it.
>> >>
>> >> Had a conversation with SSC years ago about using Paris for
>> >> classical and he really ground on me hard to try it and compare it
to
>> >> Sonic Solutions. Sonic has always been the gold standard for
>> >> classical, and honestly I thought he was full of it, but I tried it,
>using
>> >> the same source material. He was right, it was actually better than
>> >> Sonic on a 70-piece orchestra. Some of you have heard that CD.
>> >> Did it sound "vintage" or muddy to you? Of course not, you just
>> >> have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
>> >> and it works great for classical. An orchestra recorded with the
>> >> just 2 of the best mics in the world (DPA / B&K) the best pre
>> >> (no tubes please!) and a great convertor is the ultimate test for
>> >> clarity. One little loss of anything and the whole things turns to
>> >> crap. It must be eq'ed and mastered to perfection, but if it is, it
>> >> sounds like you are in the room with the orchestra.
>> >>
>> >> Paris works extremely well on an orchestra and I can tell you that
>> >> unless you push the levels the sound is as real, detailed, open and
>> >> clear as I have ever heard.

>> >> Personally, I think Paris murders PT's on orchestras. The clarity
>> >> and lack of distortion, even on the upper harmonics of high violin
>> >> notes, is really better and the soundstage and imaging is terrific.
>> >>
>> >> Try not hitting Paris so hard in the mixer, push the submix masters
>> >> all the way up, and listen to the audio get nice and pristine.
>> >>
>> >> DC
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [Lamont\[2\]](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:27:28 GMT

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

JD,
please read what Dedric stated. Second, this not a bate,nor a DAW war..For
the record, Samplitude sounds the best(imho)...

That being said, you completely missed the point. The 1975 sound is valid,
but lets not stay there..!! Do you understand!! Now!!
You idiot!!! I would say alot more, but I don't know and won;t waist any
of Kim's precious web space responding to your idiotic take on this thread..

"JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote:

>
>Sorry, I don't see this post a simply an observation, discussion or even
just
>a opinion. LaMont is saying that the old analog,tape saturated, edgy, overdriven
>sound is no longer valid. That we should all get over it and move on. That
>the Paris signature sound is no longer in, that the new PT, Nuendo sound
>is where it's at. Once again, he is saying PT/Nuendo sounds better than
>Paris. I feel this is a bate job.
>
>Sure audio equipment has evolved. Newer doesn't always mean better. A
combination
>of all tools is the smartest rout. I don't think a whole sound should be
>eliminated just because something is currently trendy. He clearly states
>he thinks that, that sound is done and we should all move on the new PT
sound.
>
>
>He can say what ever he wants, I'm just calling it like I see it.

>
>Here is LaMont's chance to clarify!
>
>"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:
>>I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach is
>
>>better than another.
>>On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our
>>preferences, and the fact that
>>currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available
>40,
>>30, 20 and even 10 years ago.
>>Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing, and
>
>>the concept of creating listener appeal
>>in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't
>
>>anything wrong with that, but recording has always
>>been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It isn't
>
>>a platform war, and never was -
>>just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the
>
>>budgets we have available.
>>
>>I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring system.
>
>>It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure,
>>but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what

>>entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit
>>from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a 4-track
>
>>cassette deck if that's what floats your
>>boat creatively.
>>
>>Regards,
>>Dedric
>>
>>
>>"JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote in message news:443fdbe4\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than Paris
>
>>> stuff
>>> again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're
>
>>> all

>>> being goaded and bated here.
>>>
>>> This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough

>>> diversity
>>> in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach
>to
>>> everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much
>
>>> trouble,
>>> five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for vary long. Just
>
>>> because
>>> a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void.
>
>>> There
>>> should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the
>>> followers,
>>> and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would
be
>
>>> more
>>> boring than they already are!
>>>
>>> The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you
>turn
>>> 26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old???
>>> How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck,
>
>>> this
>>> music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is
>>> unacceptable!
>>> No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety
>>> is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be
>
>>> acceptable!
>>> But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!
>>>
>>> LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your
>
>>> sure
>>> to end up in the same place!
>>>
>>>
>>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>>>>Good post, LaMont
>>>>
>>>>--

>>>>Martin Harrington
 >>>>www.lendaneer-sound.com
 >>>>
 >>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...
 >>>>
 >>>> Gene,
 >>>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW
 >>>> "nastalgic"
 >>>> sound thing.
 >>>>
 >>>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as
 I
 >>>> watched
 >>>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer
 >>>
 >>>> sounding
 >>>> DAW technology.
 >>>>
 >>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers
 who
 >>>
 >>>> ears
 >>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
 >>>>
 >>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The
 year
 >>>
 >>>> 1982
 >>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
 >>>
 >>>> The
 >>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
 >>>> thinking
 >>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
 >>>> instruments
 >>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
 >>>> sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled
 >>>
 >>>> vocals
 >>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
 >>>>
 >>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
 >>>
 >>>> was
 >>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Putec(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
 >>>> DBX160..2

>>>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng again,
 >>>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,
 >
 >>>>> witha
 >>>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 >>>>>
 >>>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site

 >>>>> priased
 >>>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND,
 we
 >>>
 >>>>> lawed
 >>>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
 >>>
 >>>>> enough,
 >>>>> not dull , or muddy enough..
 >>>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wine,d,screamed, bitched, moaned on
 >
 >>>>> every
 >>>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad
 >as
 >>>
 >>>>> well
 >>>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
 >>>
 >>>>> they
 >>>>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 >>>>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 >>>>> Bomb factory)....
 >>>>>
 >>>>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
 >>> days
 >>>>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to
 >
 >>>>> make
 >>>>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
 >>>
 >>>>> the
 >>>>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro
 >>>
 >>>>> Tools
 >>>>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
 >>>>> RECORD-SOUND...
 >>>>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
 >>> NO

>>>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we
 have
 >>>
 >>>> the
 >>>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
 >>>>
 >>>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market
 >and
 >>>
 >>>> keep
 >>>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
 >
 >>>> every
 >>>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izatope comes along (and others)
 >
 >>>> that
 >>>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 >>>>
 >>>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect
 >to
 >>>
 >>>> hear
 >>>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 >>>> Tankersly(I
 >>>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to
 >
 >>>> have
 >>>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
 >>> DAW
 >>>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss market
 >>>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
 >>>>
 >>>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
 >>>
 >>>> state
 >>>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,
 Paris
 >>>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
 >>>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund
 >>>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192
 >>>> converters.
 >>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's
 >nice
 >>>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters.
 >>>
 >>>> Let's

>>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time
>>>>>primarily
>>>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>>>>>
>>>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still
>>>>>sounds
>>>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
>>>> has
>>>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more
>>>>>aggressive
>>>>>when you push the gain stages.
>>>>>
>>>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other
DAWS
>>>> because
>>>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it
is
>>>
>>>>>closer
>>>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely
>>> a
>>>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>>>>
>>>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
>>>>>unnamed),
>>>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was
>big
>>>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good
>and
>>>> not
>>>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>>>> of
>>>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding
>DAWS
>>>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
>>>>>important
>>>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of

about

>>>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.

>>>>>

>>>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias.

>How

>>>>> many

>>>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal

>>>>>music?

>>>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.

>>>

>>>>>Labels

>>>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,

>>>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.

>>>>>

>>>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I

>>>>>thought

>>>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has

>at

>>>

>>>>>least

>>>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the

>>>>>realities

>>>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.

>>>>>

>>>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee

>

>>>>>myself

>>>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made

>>>>>decisions

>>>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more

>

>>>>>trendy

>>>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive

>PT

>>>

>>>>>sound".

>>>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).

>>>>>

>>>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the

>

>>>>>Waves

>>>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound

>>>>> of

>>>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like

and

>>> I

>>>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.

>>>>>

>>>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some

>>>>> people
>>>>> may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own
>>>>> preferences
>>>>> are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way.
I
>
>>>>> don't
>>>>> see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
>>>>> fighting
>>>>> over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>>>>
>>>>> And don't forget the cyclical nature of fashion almost guarantees that
>>> one
>>>>> day we will once again be "in".
>>>>>
>>>>> Gene
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:29:23 GMT

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

It was the same in the 80's & 90s..You had to have an SSL to be considered full service pro studio

EK Sound <askme@nospam.com> wrote:

>What kills me is the industry types that won't record with you if you
>don't have PT... "Hmmm... your studio can't be all that good if you
>don't have ProTools..." What you are using is of little consequence IMHO.

>

>David.

>

>Dedric Terry wrote:

>> I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach
is

>> better than another.

>> On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our

>> preferences, and the fact that

>> currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available

40,
>> 30, 20 and even 10 years ago.
>> Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing,
and
>> the concept of creating listener appeal
>> in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't

>> anything wrong with that, but recording has always
>> been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It
isn't
>> a platform war, and never was -
>> just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the

>> budgets we have available.
>>
>> I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring system.

>> It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure,
>> but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what

>> entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit
>> from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a 4-track

>> cassette deck if that's what floats your
>> boat creatively.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>>
>>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [JD](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:54:37 GMT

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

LaMont wrote

>>That being said, you completely missed the point. The 1975 sound is valid,
but lets not stay there..!!<<

Thanks for your clarification. Like I said, use all tools. That tape saturated,
over driven vintage sound fits a specific style of music well. I wasn't
out to insult you, my point was, if you pigeonhole yourself with the PT sound
only, your stuck in one place with your sound. These days, that is just
about everybody's sound. The cookie cutter sound.

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

>

>JD,

>please read what Dedric stated. Second, this not a bate,nor a DAW war..For
>the record, Samplitude sounds the best(imho)...

>

>That being said, you completely missed the point. The 1975 sound is valid,
>but lets not stay there...!! Do you understand!! Now!!

>You idiot!!! I would say alot more, but I don't know and won;t waist any
>of Kim's precious web space responding to your idiotic take on this thread..

>

>

>"JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote:

>>

>>Sorry, I don't see this post a simply an observation, discussion or even
>just

>>a opinion. LaMont is saying that the old analog,tape saturated, edgy,
overdriven

>>sound is no longer valid. That we should all get over it and move on.
That

>>the Paris signature sound is no longer in, that the new PT, Nuendo sound
>>is where it's at. Once again, he is saying PT/Nuendo sounds better than
>>Paris. I feel this is a bate job.

>>

>>Sure audio equipment has evolved. Newer doesn't always mean better. A
>combination

>>of all tools is the smartest rout. I don't think a whole sound should
be

>>eliminated just because something is currently trendy. He clearly states
>>he thinks that, that sound is done and we should all move on the new PT
>sound.

>>

>>

>>He can say what ever he wants, I'm just calling it like I see it.

>>

>>Here is LaMont's chance to clarify!

>>

>>"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:

>>>I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach
is

>>

>>>better than another.

>>>On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our
>>>preferences, and the fact that

>>>currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available
>>40,

>>>30, 20 and even 10 years ago.

>>>Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing,

and
>>
>>>the concept of creating listener appeal
>>>in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't
>>
>>>anything wrong with that, but recording has always
>>>been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It
isn't
>>
>>>a platform war, and never was -
>>>just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the
>>
>>>budgets we have available.
>>>
>>>I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring system.
>>
>>>It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure,
>>>but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what
>
>>>entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit
>>>from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a 4-track
>>
>>>cassette deck if that's what floats your
>>>boat creatively.
>>>
>>>Regards,
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>>
>>>"JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote in message news:443fdbe4\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than Paris
>>
>>>> stuff
>>>> again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're
>>
>>>> all
>>>> being goaded and bated here.
>>>>
>>>> This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough
>
>>>> diversity
>>>> in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach
>>to
>>>> everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much
>>
>>>> trouble,
>>>> five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for very long. Just

>>
>>>> because
>>>> a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void.
>>
>>>> There
>>>> should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the
>>>> followers,
>>>> and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would
>be
>>
>>>> more
>>>> boring than they already are!
>>>>
>>>> The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you
>>turn
>>>> 26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old???
>>>> How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck,
>>
>>>> this
>>>> music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is
>>>> unacceptable!
>>>> No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety
>>>> is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be
>>
>>>> acceptable!
>>>> But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!
>>>>
>>>> LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your
>>
>>>> sure
>>>> to end up in the same place!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>>>>>Good post, LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>--
>>>>>Martin Harrington
>>>>>www.lendaneer-sound.com
>>>>>
>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Gene,
>>>>>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW
>>>>>> "nastalgic"
>>>>>> sound thing.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as

>I
 >>>>> watched
 >>>>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity,
 newer
 >>>>
 >>>>> sounding
 >>>>> DAW technology.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers
 >who
 >>>>
 >>>>> ears
 >>>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddied up recordings.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The
 >year
 >>>>
 >>>>> 1982
 >>>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
 >>>>
 >>>>> The
 >>>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
 >>>>> thinking
 >>>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
 >>>>> instruments
 >>>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record

 >>>>> sound..
 >>>>>
 >>>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddied
 >>>>
 >>>>> vocals
 >>>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the
 magic
 >>>>
 >>>>> was
 >>>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
 >>>>> DBX160..2
 >>>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng
 again,
 >>>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,
 >>
 >>>>> witha
 >>>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 >>>>>
 >>>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site

>
 >>>>> priased
 >>>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND,
 >we
 >>>>
 >>>>> lawed
 >>>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
 >>>>
 >>>>> enough,
 >>>>> not dull , or muddy enough..
 >>>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on
 >>
 >>>>> every
 >>>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad
 >>as
 >>>>
 >>>>> well
 >>>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
 >>>>
 >>>>> they
 >>>>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 >>>>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 >>>>> Bomb factory)....
 >>>>>
 >>>>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
 >>>> days
 >>>>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is)
 to
 >>
 >>>>> make
 >>>>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
 >>>>
 >>>>> the
 >>>>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by
 Pro
 >>>>
 >>>>> Tools
 >>>>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
 >>>>> RECORD-SOUND...
 >>>>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
 >>>> NO
 >>>>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we
 >have
 >>>>
 >>>>> the
 >>>>> High-Fedeliy DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!

>>>>>
 >>>>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market
 >>and
 >>>>
 >>>>> keep
 >>>>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
 >>
 >>>>> every
 >>>>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others)
 >>
 >>>>> that
 >>>>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect
 >>to
 >>>>
 >>>>> hear
 >>>>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 >>>>>
 >>>>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 >>>>> Tankersly(I
 >>>>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push
 to
 >>
 >>>>> have
 >>>>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
 >>>> DAW
 >>>>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss
 market
 >>>>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
 >>>>
 >>>>> state
 >>>>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,
 >Paris
 >>>>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
 >>>>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and Brightosund
 >>>>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192
 >>>>> converters.
 >>>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's
 >>nice
 >>>>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters.
 >>>>
 >>>>> Let's
 >>>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
 >>>>>
 >>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time
>>>>>>primarily
>>>>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still
>>>>>>sounds
>>>>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris
still
>>>>> has
>>>>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more
>>>>>>aggressive
>>>>>>when you push the gain stages.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other
>DAWS
>>>>> because
>>>>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it
>is
>>>>
>>>>>>closer
>>>>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30
years?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely
>>>> a
>>>>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
>>>>>>unnamed),
>>>>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was
>>big
>>>>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good
>>and
>>>>> not
>>>>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>>>>> of
>>>>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding
>>DAWS
>>>>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
>>>>>>important
>>>>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of
>about

>>>>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias.
>>How
>>>>>> many
>>>>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal
>>>>>>music?
>>>>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
>>>>
>>>>>>Labels
>>>>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds crappy,
>>>>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but
I
>>>>>>thought
>>>>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has
>>at
>>>>
>>>>>>least
>>>>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
>>>>>>realities
>>>>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee
>>
>>>>>>myself
>>>>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made
>>>>>>decisions
>>>>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more
>>
>>>>>>trendy
>>>>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive
>>PT
>>>>
>>>>>>sound".
>>>>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the
>>
>>>>>>Waves
>>>>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the
sound
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like
>and
>>>> I
>>>>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.

>>>>>>
>>>>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some
>
>>>>>> people
>>>>>> may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own
>>>>>> preferences
>>>>>> are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way.
>I
>>
>>>>>> don't
>>>>>> see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
>>>>>> fighting
>>>>>> over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> And don't forget the cyclical nature of fashion almost guarantees
that
>>>> one
>>>>>> day we will once again be "in".
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Reality check
Posted by [Music Lab Sweden](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 21:32:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DJ, I was not referring to stability as much as compatibility. In a crowded pro market you either need PT compatibility, or full OMF support (working OMF), both which are lacking in Paris, which makes it a time consuming and cumbersome process, especially when you are working with large track counts.

And yes, you are absolutely right;-) I still remember the days when I tracked to a G24S through a Soundtracs board. I miss the fun and the feeling of being a "real" recording engineer, ping-ponging and carefully plan your every move.

A full analog "state of the art" joint would be a dream.

Babu

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

>I track with Paris with folks looking over my shoulder all the time. It's
>a matter of knowing what to do and how to do it. My system is very stable.

>

>As far as financial concerns go, yes, I stick with Paris because of
>financial concerns. If I had the money, there is not doubt at all that I'd
>be tracking to a pair of synced 2" 16 track machines and an API legacy
>console.

>

>Different strokes ;o)

>

>Deej

>"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote in message news:443ff4c0\$1@linux...

>>

>> Hi All,

>>

>> I am a former Paris user who still use Paris now and then, especially
when

>> I remix old songs recorded in Paris. I gave up in favour of Soundscape
>which

>> I truly love.

>>

>> when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left to desire.

It

>> nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT,

>Soundscape,

>> Nuendo, Samplitude etc.

>>

>> I have a fairly large Paris setup and as much magic as it has it is quite

>> unreliable compared to the other systems.

>> For example: Paris can sometimes (randomly) add strange DC offset to the

>> files. It can depending on heat cause clicks. Aux leakage. Just to mention

>Also,

>> what is by some perceived as warmth, sounds to me like a bit clouded

>midrange.

>> I have recorded a fair amount of classical choirs in both Paris, Soundscape

>> and Nuendo. In this genre there is simply no competition at all. My

>Soundscape

>> converters (Apogee) simply kills Paris in clarity and detail. OTOH with

>pop/rock,

>> especially acoustic pop/rock (live drums), Paris can sound a bit more

>exciting

>> than the others.

>>
>> Last but not least, sound aside Paris is a dinosaur. The routing options
>> leave A LOT to desire. The I/O flexibility is back to the stone age
>compared
>> to newer systems. The non-sample accurate editing is a PITA. Lack of
>professional
>> I/O options. Very rudimentary handling of native plugins, especially in
>stereo.
>> No bussing possibilities. No VST/DX on master bus. No delay compensation.
>> etc. ect...
>>
>> IMHO most people who are sticking to Paris are doing it for financial
>reasons.
>> Given the very low price the SH systems are going for, the price vs. sound
>> performance ratio is amazing, compared to other DSP-based system. In a
>true
>> professional environment with clients hanging over your shoulder, the
>compromises
>> are just too big, all IMO of course.
>>
>> Just my 2 cents.
>>
>> Babu
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >Of course not, you just
>> >have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
>> >and it works great for classical.
>> >
>> >That's the beauty of it. It works either way. There is an issue with
the
>> D/A
>> >converters and jitter when using the Paris clock, but with an external
>clock
>> >I've never thought it sounded anything other than what I wanted it to
>sound.
>> >result.....however, this is blasphemy and I have to immediately jack
the
>> >submix faders into the stratosphere so I can hear all that crappy
>distortion
>> >that I like.
>> >
>> >;O)
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote in message news:443f4acc\$1@linux...
>> >>

>> >> One myth I would like to dispel is that Paris sounds muddy, vintage,
>> >> analog or less detailed than PT's.
>> >>
>> >> It's all in how hard you hit it.
>> >>
>> >> Had a conversation with SSC years ago about using Paris for
>> >> classical and he really ground on me hard to try it and compare it
to
>> >> Sonic Solutions. Sonic has always been the gold standard for
>> >> classical, and honestly I thought he was full of it, but I tried it,
>using
>> >> the same source material. He was right, it was actually better than
>> >> Sonic on a 70-piece orchestra. Some of you have heard that CD.
>> >> Did it sound "vintage" or muddy to you? Of course not, you just
>> >> have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
>> >> and it works great for classical. An orchestra recorded with the
>> >> just 2 of the best mics in the world (DPA / B&K) the best pre
>> >> (no tubes please!) and a great convertor is the ultimate test for
>> >> clarity. One little loss of anything and the whole thing turns to
>> >> crap. It must be eq'ed and mastered to perfection, but if it is, it
>> >> sounds like you are in the room with the orchestra.
>> >>
>> >> Paris works extremely well on an orchestra and I can tell you that
>> >> unless you push the levels the sound is as real, detailed, open and
>> >> clear as I have ever heard.
>> >> Personally, I think Paris murders PT's on orchestras. The clarity
>> >> and lack of distortion, even on the upper harmonics of high violin
>> >> notes, is really better and the soundstage and imaging is terrific.
>> >>
>> >> Try not hitting Paris so hard in the mixer, push the submix masters
>> >> all the way up, and listen to the audio get nice and pristine.
>> >>
>> >> DC
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Reality check
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 22:17:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There is something satisfying about a console and outboard gear. At the same time, I can't say I miss running a mix 14 times because my left hand twitched from lack of sleep and bumped the guitar solo 1db higher than I wanted it; or writing down every setting because I'm anal about being able

to recreate what I created.

I absolutely love having complete recall and full automation in DAWs though.
I sleep more now, at least I did before we had kids... :-)

If someone gave me a fully equipped analog studio, I wouldn't turn it down though.

Regards,
Dedric

On 4/14/06 3:32 PM, in article 444014d0\$1@linux, "Babu"

<musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

> And yes, you are absolutely right;-) I still remember the days when I tracked
> to a G24S through a Soundtracs board. I miss the fun and the feeling of being
> a "real" recording engineer, ping-ponging and carefully plan your every move.
>
>
> It's just not as much fun as it used to be...
>
> A full analog "state of the art" joint would be a dream.
>
> Babu

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 23:54:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Everyone is making good points in this discussion, but remember, unless we are producing film soundtracks, (or similar), our sounds, be it music, voice or fx, are mostly going to be heard on an MP3 device of some sort, (player or radio), at least until the new generation of HiDef players are released, and then we are going to have the format wars starting all over again. No matter what equipment we use, the end result, in real terms, is MP3, (or MP4).

--

Martin Harrington
www.lendaneer-sound.com

"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message news:443fe185@linux...

>I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach is
>better than another.
> On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our
> preferences, and the fact that
> currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available
> 40, 30, 20 and even 10 years ago.
> Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing, and

> the concept of creating listener appeal
> in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't
> anything wrong with that, but recording has always
> been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It
> isn't a platform war, and never was -
> just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the
> budgets we have available.
>
> I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring
> system. It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure,
> but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what
> entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit
> from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a 4-track
> cassette deck if that's what floats your
> boat creatively.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>
> "JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote in message news:443fdbe4\$1@linux...
>>
>> Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than Paris
>> stuff
>> again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're
>> all
>> being goaded and bated here.
>>
>> This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough
>> diversity
>> in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach
>> to
>> everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much
>> trouble,
>> five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for vary long. Just
>> because
>> a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void.
>> There
>> should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the
>> followers,
>> and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would be
>> more
>> boring than they already are!
>>
>> The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you
>> turn
>> 26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old???
>> How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck,

>> this
>> music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is
>> unacceptable!
>> No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety
>> is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be
>> acceptable!
>> But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!
>>
>> LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your
>> sure
>> to end up in the same place!
>>
>>
>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>>> Good post, LaMont
>>>
>>>--
>>> Martin Harrington
>>> www.lendanear-sound.com
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message
>>> news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Gene,
>>>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW
>>>> "nastalgic"
>>>> sound thing.
>>>>
>>>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I
>>>> watched
>>>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer
>>
>>>> sounding
>>>> DAW technology.
>>>>
>>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers who
>>
>>>> ears
>>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
>>>>
>>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
>>
>>>> 1982
>>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
>>
>>>> The
>>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
>>>> thinking

>>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
 >>>> instruments
 >>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
 >>>> sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddied
 >>
 >>>> vocals
 >>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
 >>>>
 >>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
 >>
 >>>> was
 >>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
 >>>> DBX160..2
 >>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng
 >>>> again,
 >>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,
 >>>> witha
 >>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site
 >>>> priased
 >>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we
 >>
 >>>> lawed
 >>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
 >>
 >>>> enough,
 >>>> not dull , or muddy enough..
 >>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on
 >>>> every
 >>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as
 >>
 >>>> well
 >>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
 >>
 >>>> they
 >>>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 >>>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 >>>> Bomb factory)....
 >>>>
 >>>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
 >> days
 >>>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to
 >>>> make
 >>>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
 >>

>>>> the
 >>>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
 >>>>
 >>>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro
 >>
 >>>> Tools
 >>>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
 >>>> RECORD-SOUND...
 >>>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
 >> NO
 >>>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have
 >>
 >>>> the
 >>>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
 >>>>
 >>>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and
 >>
 >>>> keep
 >>>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
 >>>> every
 >>>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others)
 >>>> that
 >>>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 >>>>
 >>>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to
 >>
 >>>> hear
 >>>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 >>>> Tankersly(I
 >>>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to
 >>>> have
 >>>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
 >> DAW
 >>>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss
 >>>> market
 >>>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
 >>>>
 >>>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
 >>
 >>>> state
 >>>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,
 >>>> Paris
 >>>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
 >>>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and
 >>>> Brightosund
 >>>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192

>>>> converters.
>>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's
>>>> nice
>>>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu converters.
>>
>>>> Let's
>>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time
>>>>>primarily
>>>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>>>>>
>>>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still
>>>>>sounds
>>>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
>>>> has
>>>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more
>>>>>aggressive
>>>>>when you push the gain stages.
>>>>>
>>>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWs
>>>> because
>>>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is
>>
>>>>>closer
>>>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30
>>>>>years?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely
>> a
>>>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>>>>
>>>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
>>>>>unnamed),
>>>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was
>>>>>big
>>>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
>>>> not
>>>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>>>> of
>>>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding

>>>>>DAWS
>>>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
>>>>>important
>>>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of
>>>>>about
>>>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>>>>
>>>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
>>>> many
>>>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal
>>>>>music?
>>>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
>>
>>>>>Labels
>>>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds
>>>>>crappy,
>>>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>>>>
>>>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I
>>>>>thought
>>>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at
>>
>>>>>least
>>>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
>>>>>realities
>>>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>>>>
>>>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee
>>>>>myself
>>>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made
>>>>>decisions
>>>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more
>>>>>trendy
>>>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT
>>
>>>>>sound".
>>>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>>>>
>>>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the
>>>>>Waves
>>>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
>>>> of
>>>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and
>> I
>>>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>>>>
>>>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some
>>>>> people

>>>>>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own
>>>>>preferences
>>>>>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I
>>>>>don't
>>>>>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
>>>>>fighting
>>>>>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>>>>
>>>>>And don't forget.the cyclical nature of fashion almost guarantees that
>> one
>>>>>day we will once again be "in".
>>>>>
>>>>>Gene
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 00:29:41 GMT

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

Hey DJ,

Point taken.. However, I think it's more perception than real quality. For example: Just yesterday I was listening to one my all-time favorite albums/CD..Steely Dan's Aja!! While Deacon Blues is playing, I start thinking, -Is his album great because--

- Great Sound quality/engineering
- Great songs
- Great performances.
- All the above

We, if I'm honest with myself, I'd have to say that All could apply, BUT, when I listen to the drums, they sound like cardboard boxes...Chuck Rainey's Bass is not a true representation of a Fender Precision, it has been dumb-down to thuds.. Horn-Fine, Rhodes-fines, Guitars-Fine..But, is that way a band sound "naturally".. Or is it the cookie cutter approach to mixing..Getting the tight mix sound..??

Maybe Bruce Swedien approach of analog to capture, then off to digital land is the sonic way.. Lord knows his productions with "The Gloved" one are truly "works of sonic art" , productions, engineering second to none..

But, to say something is pleasing to the ears is a learned behavior of the "RecordSound".. The old guard engineers for some reason were "scare of the digital sound until they were able to make it sound close to 1975. Audio tools are just that tools that are like color pallets for an artist. But, it seems that no matter the strides in technology, the old guard wants to keep the overall sound 1975 regardless of what recording medium you are using (2inch, ADAT, D-88, MDR, DAWs).. That's disturbing to me..

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

>I think it's great that we don't have to deal with some of the issues that
>made recording such a chore and required such a number of tools to deal
>with, but I'm not nearly as convinced as you guys that *accurate is better*.
>Listen to the Dixie Chicks first CD that was recorded to tape and then
>subsequent ones that were recorded to digital. The latter efforts sound
>great, but they don't sound as pleasing to my ear as the first one. The
>remix of Hotel California is another example of digital awfulness. It's
very
>accurate and sounds like pure crap, IMO.....and it was originally recorded
>to tape and then PT'ed. Sorry, but it does sound terrible compared to the
>original to my ears. With all of the new nice shiny tools we have available
>today, it's possible to hear *more* as far as digital ugliness is concerned
>as well. Analog gear and tape provides glue. Lots of stuff falls apart
>without glue.

>

>Deej

>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:443fd3ca\$1@linux...

>>

>> Dedric, once again, with a tear in my left eye-smile :) You have state

>what

>> I was going to say in response to my original post.

>> Thanks buddy...

>>

>> "The overwhelming impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading

>> the history of it, is that the goal of recording has always been to

>recreate

>> what we hear as accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along
the

>> way when engineers

>> quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do

>that,

>> someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy

>venture."

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> >I don't think, or at least I hope, there won't be a continued trend for
>> FM,
>> >compressed radio and 64k mp3s to dictate sound. When I think of
>> >"outdated"
>> >I think of limited bandwidth, sometimes noisy, and often mushy sound
>> -
>> >not
>> >a
>> >recording style, or even mixing style necessarily, although it does
>> >change
>> >based on pop culture and available technology more than science.
>> >
>> >A while back I read a bit on the history of recording. The overwhelming
>> >impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading the history
>> >of
>> >it,
>> >is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate what we hear
>> >as
>> >accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the way when
>> >engineers
>> >quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do
>> >that,
>> >someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy
>> >venture. Obviously there are creative requirements that eliminate
>> >accuracy
>> >(I once tried a binaural head test-analysis mic system on vocals -
>> >sucked,
>> >but it was incredibly accurate, which goes to show that not all we hear
>> >is
>> >as we would prefer to hear it).
>> >
>> >Hence now we have, for example, kicks that sound nothing like the real
>> >think
>> >- where you had a "koomphhh" or "doomphhh" to start with, the "standard"
>> >is
>> >to make it sound more like a "thmp" or "dhmp" (pardon my "technical"
>> >terminology). Gating, compression, EQ, even if not necessary to fix
>> >recording problems, have become a means to not just make the mix fit
>> >together, but alter the sound to what has become the radio standard.
>> >Much
>> >of it sounds great for what it is, but it isn't about accurate recording
>> >anymore, and that makes it hyper-dependant on popular trends rather than
>> >audiology.
>> >
>> >Regards,
>> >Dedric
>> >

>> >On 4/13/06 11:53 PM, in article 443f38eb\$1@linux, "gene lennon"
>> ><glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >>
>> >> So I recognize my own prejudices, I think I clearly see the new trends,
>> but
>> >> I don't prefer the new sound. I have no doubt that for many listeners
>> now
>> >> and most in the future I will be from "The school of the outdated
>sound."
>> >>
>> >> gene
>> >>
>> >> "LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>> Gene,
>> >>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW
>"nostalgic"
>> >>> sound thing.
>> >>>
>> >>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as
I
>> watched
>> >>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity,
>newer
>> >> sounding
>> >>> DAW technology.
>> >>>
>> >>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers
who
>> ears
>> >>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
>> >>>
>> >>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The
>year
>> >> 1982
>> >>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI
>mixer..Fine..
>> >> The
>> >>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
>thinking
>> >>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
>instruments
>> >>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
>sound..
>> >>>
>> >>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled
>> vocals

>> >>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
>> >>>
>> >>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the
>magic
>> >> was
>> >>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
>DBX160..2
>> >>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng
>again,
>> >>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,
>witha
>> >>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
>> >>>
>> >>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site
>priased
>> >>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND,
we
>> lawed
>> >>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
>> enough,
>> >>> not dull , or muddy enough..
>> >>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on
>every
>> >>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad
as
>> well
>> >>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
>> they
>> >>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
>> >>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
>> >>> Bomb factory)....
>> >>>
>> >>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
>> days
>> >>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is)
to
>> make
>> >>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in
>all..Make
>> >> the
>> >>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
>> >>>
>> >>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by
Pro
>> Tools
>> >>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
>> >>> RECORD-SOUND...
>> >>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today

>having
 >> >> NO
 >> >>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we
 >have
 >> >> the
 >> >>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
 >> >>>
 >> >>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market
 >and
 >> >> keep
 >> >>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
 >every
 >> >>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others)
 >> that
 >> >>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 >> >>>
 >> >>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect
 to
 >> hear
 >> >>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 >> >>>
 >> >>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 >> >>> Tankersly(I
 >> >>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push
 to
 >> have
 >> >>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
 >> DAW
 >> >>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss
 >market
 >> >>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
 >> >>>
 >> >>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the
 >cureent
 >> >> state
 >> >>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,
 >Paris
 >> >>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
 >> >>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and
 >Brightosund
 >> >>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192
 >converters.
 >> >>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's
 >nice
 >> >>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu
 >converters.
 >> >> Let's
 >> >>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!

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

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Reality check
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 00:35:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dj, we've benn with Paris for along time. In that time, if your were to do search on all the DAW updates, and ancillary gear, I know you've spent way more than a 2 inch 16 track machine and API console..Both can be had at arther good prices. :)
Your Cubabse SX to Paris saga alone cost \$\$\$\$:) AND, you are still going :)

I got Pris, becuase it was/is a compte system, like PT..I hate this peice-milling aproach to DAWsss:) Yuck...:)
Take care

"JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote:

>
>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>I track with Paris with folks looki9ng over my shoulder all the time.
It's
>>a matter of knowing what to do and how to do it. My system is very stable.
>>
>>As far as financial concerns go, yes, I stick with Paris because of
>>financial concerns. If I had the money, there is not doubt at all that
I'd
>>be tracking to a pair of synced 2" 16 track machines and an API legacy
>>console.
>>
>>Different strokes ;o)
>>
>>Deej
>
>Deej, you are so 1975 in your thinking! LOL
>
>>"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote in message news:443ff4c0\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Hi All,
>>>
>>> I am a former Paris user who still use Paris now and then, especially
>when

>>> I remix old songs recorded in Paris. I gave up in favour of Soundscape
>>which
>>> I truly love.
>>>

but

>>> when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left to desire.
>It
>>> nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT,
>>Soundscape,
>>> Nuendo, Samplitude etc.
>>>
>>> I have a fairly large Paris setup and as much magic as it has it is quite
>>> unreliable compared to the other systems.
>>> For example: Paris can sometimes (randomly) add strange DC offset to
the
>>> files. It can depending on heat cause clicks. Aux leakage. Just to mention

>>Also,
>>> what is by some perceived as warmth, sounds to me like a bit clouded
>>midrange.
>>> I have recorded a fair amount of classical choirs in both Paris, Soundscape
>>> and Nuendo. In this genre there is simply no competition at all. My
>>Soundscape
>>> converters (Apogee) simply kills Paris in clarity and detail. OTOH with
>>pop/rock,
>>> especially acoustic pop/rock (live drums), Paris can sound a bit more
>>exciting
>>> than the others.
>>>
>>> Last but not least, sound aside Paris is a dinosaur. The routing options
>>> leave A LOT to desire. The I/O flexibility is back to the stone age
>>compared
>>> to newer systems. The non-sample accurate editing is a PITA. Lack of
>>professional
>>> I/O options. Very rudimentary handling of native plugins, especially
in
>>stereo.
>>> No bussing possibilities. No VST/DX on master bus. No delay compensation.
>>> etc. ect...
>>>
>>> IMHO most people who are sticking to Paris are doing it for financial
>>reasons.
>>> Given the very low price the SH systems are going for, the price vs.
sound
>>> performance ratio is amazing, compared to other DSP-based system. In
a
>>true

>>> professional enviroment with clients hanging over your shoulder, the
>>compromises
>>> are just to big, all IMO of course.
>>>
>>> Just my 2 cents.
>>>
>>> Babu
>>>
>>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>> >Of course not, you just
>>> >have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
>>> >and it works great for classical.
>>> >
>>> >That's the beauty of it. It works either way. There is an issue with
>the
>>> D/A
>>> >converters and jitter when using the Paris clock, but with an external
>>clock
>>> >I've never thought it sounded anything other than what I wanted it to
>>sound.
>>> >result.....however, this is blasphemy and I have to immediately jack
>the
>>> >submix faders into the stratosphere so I can hear all that crappy
>>distortion
>>> >that I like.
>>> >
>>> >;O)
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote in message news:443f4acc\$1@linux...
>>> >>
>>> >> One myth I would like to dispel is that Paris sounds muddy, vintage,
>>> >> analog or less detailed than PT's.
>>> >>
>>> >> It's all in how hard you hit it.
>>> >>
>>> >> Had a conversation with SSC years ago about using Paris for
>>> >> classical and he really ground on me hard to try it and compare it
>to
>>> >> Sonic Solutions. Sonic has always been the gold standard for
>>> >> classical, and honestly I thought he was full of it, but I tried it,
>>using
>>> >> the same source material. He was right, it was actually better than
>>> >> Sonic on a 70-piece orchestra. Some of you have heard that CD.
>>> >> Did it sound "vintage" or muddy to you? Of course not, you just
>>> >> have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
>>> >> and it works great for classical. An orchestra recorded with the

>>> >> just 2 of the best mics in the world (DPA / B&K) the best pre
>>> >> (no tubes please!) and a great convertor is the ultimate test for
>>> >> clarity. One little loss of anything and the whole thing turns to
>>> >> crap. It must be eq'ed and mastered to perfection, but if it is,
it
>>> >> sounds like you are in the room with the orchestra.
>>> >>
>>> >> Paris works extremely well on an orchestra and I can tell you that
>>> >> unless you push the levels the sound is as real, detailed, open and
>>> >> clear as I have ever heard.
>>> >> Personally, I think Paris murders PT's on orchestras. The clarity
>>> >> and lack of distortion, even on the upper harmonics of high violin
>>> >> notes, is really better and the soundstage and imaging is terrific.
>>> >>
>>> >> Try not hitting Paris so hard in the mixer, push the submix masters
>>> >> all the way up, and listen to the audio get nice and pristine.
>>> >>
>>> >> DC
>>> >
>>> >
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 00:56:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The fact that this (PT/Paris debate, ad naseum) is actually even still a discussion after Paris being "dead" for this long says a whhhooole lot about Paris, dunnit?

What a waste, thanks Creative, for your lack of vision :(

AA

"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message news:443fe185@linux...
>I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach is
>better than another.
> On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our
> preferences, and the fact that
> currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available
> 40, 30, 20 and even 10 years ago.
> Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing, and
> the concept of creating listener appeal
> in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't

> anything wrong with that, but recording has always
> been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It
> isn't a platform war, and never was -
> just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the
> budgets we have available.
>
> I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring
> system. It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure,
> but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what
> entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit
> from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a 4-track
> cassette deck if that's what floats your
> boat creatively.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
>
> "JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote in message news:443fdbe4\$1@linux...
>>
>> Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than Paris
>> stuff
>> again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're
>> all
>> being goaded and bated here.
>>
>> This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough
>> diversity
>> in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach
>> to
>> everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much
>> trouble,
>> five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for very long. Just
>> because
>> a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void.
>> There
>> should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the
>> followers,
>> and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would be
>> more
>> boring than they already are!
>>
>> The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you
>> turn
>> 26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old???
>> How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck,
>> this
>> music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is

>> unacceptable!
>> No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety
>> is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be
>> acceptable!
>> But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!
>>
>> LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your
>> sure
>> to end up in the same place!
>>
>>
>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>>> Good post, LaMont
>>>
>>>--
>>> Martin Harrington
>>> www.lendaneer-sound.com
>>>
>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message
>>> news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...
>>>
>>>> Gene,
>>>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW
>>>> "nostalgic"
>>>> sound thing.
>>>>
>>>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I
>>>> watched
>>>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fidelity, newer
>>
>>>> sounding
>>>> DAW technology.
>>>>
>>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old" guard Engineers who
>>
>>>> ears
>>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
>>>>
>>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The year
>>
>>>> 1982
>>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
>>
>>>> The
>>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
>>>> thinking
>>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
>>>> instruments

>>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
 >>>> sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddied
 >>
 >>>> vocals
 >>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
 >>>>
 >>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
 >>
 >>>> was
 >>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
 >>>> DBX160..2
 >>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng
 >>>> again,
 >>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,
 >>>> witha
 >>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site
 >>>> priased
 >>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we
 >>
 >>>> lawed
 >>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
 >>
 >>>> enough,
 >>>> not dull , or muddy enough..
 >>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on
 >>>> every
 >>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad as
 >>
 >>>> well
 >>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
 >>
 >>>> they
 >>>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 >>>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 >>>> Bomb factory)....
 >>>>
 >>>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
 >> days
 >>>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to
 >>>> make
 >>>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
 >>
 >>>> the
 >>>> mixes sound like 1975!!!

>>>>
 >>>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro
 >>
 >>>> Tools
 >>>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
 >>>> RECORD-SOUND...
 >>>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
 >> NO
 >>>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we have
 >>
 >>>> the
 >>>> High-Fedality DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
 >>>>
 >>>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market and
 >>
 >>>> keep
 >>>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
 >>>> every
 >>>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others)
 >>>> that
 >>>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 >>>>
 >>>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect to
 >>
 >>>> hear
 >>>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 >>>>
 >>>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 >>>> Tankersly(I
 >>>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to
 >>>> have
 >>>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
 >> DAW
 >>>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss
 >>>> market
 >>>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
 >>>>
 >>>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
 >>
 >>>> state
 >>>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,
 >>>> Paris
 >>>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
 >>>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and
 >>>> Brightosund
 >>>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192
 >>>> converters.
 >>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's

>>>> nice
>>>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu converters.
>>
>>>> Let's
>>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time
>>>>>primarily
>>>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>>>>>
>>>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still
>>>>>sounds
>>>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
>>>> has
>>>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more
>>>>>aggressive
>>>>>when you push the gain stages.
>>>>>
>>>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS
>>>> because
>>>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is
>>
>>>>>closer
>>>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30
>>>>>years?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely
>> a
>>>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>>>>
>>>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
>>>>>unnamed),
>>>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was
>>>>>big
>>>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and
>>>> not
>>>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>>>> of
>>>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding
>>>>>DAWS
>>>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more

>>>>>important
>>>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of
>>>>>about
>>>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>>>>
>>>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias. How
>>>> many
>>>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal
>>>>>music?
>>>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
>>
>>>>>Labels
>>>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds
>>>>>crappy,
>>>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>>>>
>>>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I
>>>>>thought
>>>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has at
>>
>>>>>least
>>>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
>>>>>realities
>>>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>>>>
>>>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee
>>>>>myself
>>>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made
>>>>>decisions
>>>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more
>>>>>trendy
>>>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT
>>
>>>>>sound".
>>>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>>>>
>>>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the
>>>>>Waves
>>>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
>>>> of
>>>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and
>> I
>>>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>>>>
>>>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some
>>>>> people
>>>>>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own
>>>>>preferences

```
>>>>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I  
>>>>don't  
>>>>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth  
>>>>fighting  
>>>>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.  
>>>>  
>>>>And don't forget.the cyclical nature of fashion almost guarantees tha  
>> one  
>>>>day we will once again be "in".  
>>>>  
>>>>Gene  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>  
>
```

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Edna Sloan](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:19:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Amen! A pithy observation.
E

"Aaron Allen" <nosspam@not_here.dude> wrote in message news:44404413@linux...
> The fact that this (PT/Paris debate, ad naseum) is actually even still a
> discussion after Paris being "dead" for this long says a whhhhoole lot
about
> Paris, dunnit?
> What a waste, thanks Creative, for your lack of vision :(
>
> AA
>
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message news:443fe185@linux...
> > I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach is
> > better than another.
> > On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our
> > preferences, and the fact that
> > currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available
> > 40, 30, 20 and even 10 years ago.
> > Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing,

and

> > the concept of creating listener appeal
> > in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't
> > anything wrong with that, but recording has always
> > been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It
> > isn't a platform war, and never was -
> > just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the
> > budgets we have available.

> >

> > I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring
> > system. It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure,
> > but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what
> > entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit
> > from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a
4-track

> > cassette deck if that's what floats your
> > boat creatively.

> >

> > Regards,

> > Dedric

> >

> >

> > "JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote in message news:443fdbe4\$1@linux...

> >>

> >> Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than
Paris

> >> stuff

> >> again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're

> >> all

> >> being goaded and bated here.

> >>

> >> This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough
> >> diversity

> >> in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach
> >> to

> >> everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much
> >> trouble,

> >> five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for very long. Just
> >> because

> >> a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void.

> >> There

> >> should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the

> >> followers,

> >> and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would be
> >> more

> >> boring than they already are!

> >>

> >> The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you

> >> turn
> >> 26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old???
> >> How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck,
> >> this
> >> music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is
> >> unacceptable!
> >> No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety
> >> is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be
> >> acceptable!
> >> But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!
> >>
> >> LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your
> >> sure
> >> to end up in the same place!
> >>
> >>
> >> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
> >>> Good post, LaMont
> >>>
> >>>--
> >>> Martin Harrington
> >>> www.lendanear-sound.com
> >>>
> >>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message
> >>> news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...
> >>>>
> >>>> Gene,
> >>>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW
> >>>> "nostalgic"
> >>>> sound thing.
> >>>>
> >>>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as I
> >>>> watched
> >>>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity,
newer
> >>
> >>>> sounding
> >>>> DAW technology.
> >>>>
> >>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers
who
> >>
> >>>> ears
> >>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
> >>>>
> >>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The
year

> >>
 > >>>> 1982
 > >>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 ich Otari MTR, MCI
 mixer..Fine..
 > >>
 > >>>> The
 > >>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
 > >>>> thinking
 > >>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
 > >>>> instruments
 > >>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
 > >>>> sound..
 > >>>>
 > >>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the
 muddied
 > >>
 > >>>> vocals
 > >>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
 > >>>>
 > >>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the
 magic
 > >>
 > >>>> was
 > >>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Pute(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
 > >>>> DBX160..2
 > >>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng
 > >>>> again,
 > >>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,
 > >>>> witha
 > >>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 > >>>>
 > >>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site
 > >>>> priased
 > >>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND, we
 > >>
 > >>>> lawed
 > >>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
 > >>
 > >>>> enough,
 > >>>> not dull , or muddy enough..
 > >>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on
 > >>>> every
 > >>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad
 as
 > >>
 > >>>> well
 > >>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box)
 unless

> >>
 > >>>> they
 > >>>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 > >>>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 > >>>> Bomb factory)....
 > >>>>
 > >>>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resources to reclaim the glories
 > >> days
 > >>>> with the birth of the "Vintage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to
 > >>>> make
 > >>>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, all in
 all..Make
 > >>
 > >>>> the
 > >>>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
 > >>>>
 > >>>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro
 > >>
 > >>>> Tools
 > >>>> HD and Nuendo, Sonar there's a shift occurring in the "Holy-Grail "
 > >>>> RECORD-SOUND...
 > >>>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today
 having
 > >> NO
 > >>>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get the 1975" sound, we
 have
 > >>
 > >>>> the
 > >>>> High-Fidelity DAW sound in all its glory!! ..Yipee!!
 > >>>>
 > >>>> Still, the old guard continues to hold its thumb on the DAW market
 and
 > >>
 > >>>> keep
 > >>>> driving manufacturers to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
 > >>>> every
 > >>>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and others)
 > >>>> that
 > >>>> challenge the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 > >>>>
 > >>>> Today kids are brought on the Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect
 to
 > >>
 > >>>> hear
 > >>>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 > >>>>
 > >>>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 > >>>> Tankersly(I

> >>>> adore), Nuendo endorsers, vintage engineers) will continue to push to
 > >>>> have
 > >>>> all of their 1960, 79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
 > >> DAW
 > >>>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss
 > >>>> market
 > >>>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with today's DAW.
 > >>>>
 > >>>> For me, they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the
 current
 > >>
 > >>>> state
 > >>>> of very high fidelity that's afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,
 > >>>> Paris
 > >>>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
 > >>>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and
 > >>>> Brightsund
 > >>>> with bottom..So be it..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192
 > >>>> converters.
 > >>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's
 > >>>> nice
 > >>>> wide -spacious, clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu
 converters.
 > >>
 > >>>> Let's
 > >>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
 > >>>>
 > >>>>
 > >>>>
 > >>>>
 > >>>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
 > >>>>>
 > >>>>>
 > >>>>> I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time
 > >>>>> primarily
 > >>>>> for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
 > >>>>>
 > >>>>> When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still
 > >>>>> sounds
 > >>>>> different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris
 still
 > >>>> has
 > >>>>> more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more
 > >>>>> aggressive
 > >>>>> when you push the gain stages.
 > >>>>>
 > >>>>> So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other
 DAWs

> >>>> because
> >>>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is
> >>
> >>>>>closer
> >>>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30
> >>>>>years?
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is
largely
> >> a
> >>>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
> >>>>>unnamed),
> >>>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was
> >>>>>big
> >>>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good
and
> >>>> not
> >>>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a
number
> >>>> of
> >>>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding
> >>>>>DAWS
> >>>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
> >>>>>important
> >>>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of
> >>>>>about
> >>>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias.
How
> >>>> many
> >>>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal
> >>>>>music?
> >>>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just
teens.
> >>
> >>>>>Labels
> >>>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds
> >>>>>crappy,
> >>>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I
> >>>>>thought
> >>>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has
at

> >>
> >>>>least
> >>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
> >>>>realities
> >>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
> >>>>
> >>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee
> >>>>myself
> >>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made
> >>>>decisions
> >>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more
> >>>>trendy
> >>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive
PT
> >>
> >>>>sound".
> >>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
> >>>>
> >>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the
> >>>>Waves
> >>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the
sound
> >>>> of
> >>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like
and
> >> I
> >>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
> >>>>
> >>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some
> >>>> people
> >>>>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own
> >>>>preferences
> >>>>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I
> >>>>don't
> >>>>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
> >>>>fighting
> >>>>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
> >>>>
> >>>>And don't forget.the cyclical nature of fashion almost guarantees
that
> >> one
> >>>>day we will once again be "in".
> >>>>
> >>>>Gene
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>

> >
> >
>
>
> I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
> <http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Michele Hobbs](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:48:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

To take things off-topic a bit, this is what has always cracked me up about the "audiophile" entertainment system crowd. Many of them describe stereo and surround sound entertainment systems as sounding "like you're at a concert". What many of them don't realize is that barring orchestral recording, we're compressing, gating and noise-reducing the crap out of everything, so what they're hearing will never be totally "like a concert".

LaMont wrote:

> Dedric, once again, with a tear in my left eye-smile :) You have state what
> I was going to say in response to my original post.
> Thanks buddy...
>
> "The overwhelming impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading
> the history of it, is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate
> what we hear as accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the
> way when engineers
> quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do that,
> someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy venture."
>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:58:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Exactly

Being a good recording engineer means having the skills to produce the perception of naturalness and reality from recordings that are anything but. Mics do not hear like ears.

BTW, even in classical, there is a lot of funny biz going on sometimes. I've only added reverb a couple of times, but we edit edit edit. One of the Dorian recordings has a reported 3000 edits. yeah that's reality..

DC

Michele Hobbs <michelehobbs@comcast.net> wrote:

>To take things off-topic a bit, this is what has always cracked me up
>about the "audiophile" entertainment system crowd. Many of them
>describe stereo and surround sound entertainment systems as sounding
>"like you're at a concert". What many of them don't realize is that
>barring orchestral recording, we're compressing, gating and
>noise-reducing the crap out of everything, so what they're hearing will

>never be totally "like a concert".

>

>LaMont wrote:

>> Dedric, once again, with a tear in my left eye-smile :) You have state what

>> I was going to say in response to my original post.

>> Thanks buddy...

>>

>> "The overwhelming impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading
>> the history of it, is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate
>> what we hear as accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the

>> way when engineers

>> quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do that,

>> someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy venture."

>>

>>

>>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 02:33:34 GMT

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

I'm a big fan of *the Dan* and I hear what you're saying. However, I have also given Donald Fagen's subsequent efforts a good listen and the tracks on Kamikiriad sound very prittle to my ears. Of course, these may have been recorded to ADAT or early Pro Tools. Roger Nichols is a big fan of digital and, IMO, a great engineer. Even though the drums on Aja aren't *contemporary sounding*, I still think they work within the context of the

whole mix and that's the point. I'm really not opposed to your point of view or philosophy in this matter. For me, personally, I haven't found a DAW that I think is the magic bullet.

Ideally, for me, the trick would be to track directly to 2", while outputting the playback head to some high-end converter straight to RADAR Nyquist, then mixing analog using Nyquist/Lavry/Weiss.etc or equal converters for patching quality analog gear through the board.

All I need now is money. As for the cost of my system, it's really not that much compared to new PT system and as for Soundscape, I've got a good friend in Austin who uses it, but with an analog board. I almost made the switch to Soundscape, but to get a comparable system to my Paris rig would have cost me waaayyyyyyy more than the combined cost of my Paris rig, Cubase rig, outboard converters word clock modules, UAD-1 cards, digital patchbays and miles of analog and digital cabling.....wayyyyy more.

I know my rig is a kludge, but I planned it that way. If I was working in the same environment you do, I'd be all over Pro Tools. It wouldn't make any sense not to be..and it think it's very cool that it now sounds very good. I respect your thinking and opinions here.

;o)

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:44403e75\$1@linux...

>

> Hey DJ,

>

> Point taken.. However, I think it's more perception than real quality. For
> example: Just yesterday I was listening to one my all-time favorite
albums/CD..Steely

> Dan's Aja!! While Deacon Blues is playing, I start thinking,

> -Is his album great because--

>

> -Great Sound quality/engineering

> -Great songs

> -Great performances.

> -All the above

>

> We, if I'm honest with myself, I'd have to say that All could apply, BUT,

> when I listen to the drums, they sound like cardboard boxes...Chuck
Rainey's

> Bass is not a true representation of a Fender Precision, it has been
dumb-down

> to thuds.. Horn-Fine, Rhodes-fines, Guitars-Fine..But, is that way a band

> sound "naturally".. Or is it the cookie cutter approach to mixing..Getting

> the tight mix sound..??

>

> Maybe Bruce Swedien approach of analog to capture, then off to digital

> land is the sonic way.. Lord knows his productions with "The Gloved" one

> are truly "works of sonic art" , productions, engineering second to none..

>

> But, to say soemthing is pleasing to the ears is a learned behavior of the

> "RecordSound".. The old guard engineers for some reason were "scare of the

> digital sound until they were able to make it sound close to 1975. Audio

> tools are just that tools that are like color paltets for and artist. But,

> it seems that n matter the strides in technolgy, the old guard wants to keep

> the overall sound 1975 reguadles of what recording medium you are using(

> 2inch,Adat,D-88,MDR, DAWS)..That's disturbing to me..

>

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

> >I think it's great that we don't have to deal with some of the issues that

> >made recording such a chore and required such a number of tools to deal

> >with, but I'm not nearly as convinced as you guys that *accurate is better*.

> >Listen to the Dixie Chicks first CD that was recorded to tape and then

> >subsequent ones that were recorded to digital. The latter fefforts sound

> >great, but they don't sound as pleasing to my ear as the first one. The

> >remix of Hotel California is another example of digital awfulness. It's

> very

> >accurate and sounds like pure crap, IMO.....and it was originally recorded

> >to tape and then PT'ed. Sorry, but it doee sound terrible compared to the

> >original to my ears. With all of the new nice shiny tools we have available

> >today, it's possible to hear *more* as far as dugital ugliness is concerned

> >as well. Analog gear and tape provides glue. Lots of stuff falls apart

> >without glue.

> >

> >Deej

> >"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:443fd3ca\$1@linux...

> >>

> >> Dedric, once again, with a tear in my left eye-smile :) You have state

> >what

> >> I was going to say in response to my original post.

> >> Thanks buddy...

> >>

> >> "The overwhelming impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading

> >> the history of it, is that the goal of recording has always been to

> >recreate

> >> what we hear as accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along

> the

> >> way when engineers

> >> quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do

> >that,
> >> someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy
> >venture."
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
> >> >I don't think, or at least I hope, there won't be a continued trend
for
> >> FM,
> >> >compressed radio and 64k mp3s to dictate sound. When I think of
> >"outdated"
> >> >I think of limited bandwidth, sometimes noisy, and often mushy sound
> -
> >not
> >> a
> >> >recording style, or even mixing style necessarily, although it does
> >change
> >> >based on pop culture and available technology more than science.
> >> >
> >> >A while back I read a bit on the history of recording. The
overwhelming
> >> >impression and approach I've taken, and got from reading the history
> of
> >> it,
> >> >is that the goal of recording has always been to recreate what we hear
> as
> >> >accurately as possible. Yet, I think somewhere along the way when
> >engineers
> >> >quickly realized that technology was a long way from being able to do
> >that,
> >> >someone decided to make it a creative venture rather than an accuracy
> >> >venture. Obviously there are creative requirements that eliminate
> >accuracy
> >> >(I once tried a binaural head test-analysis mic system on vocals -
> >sucked,
> >> >but it was incredibly accurate, which goes to show that not all we
hear
> >> is
> >> >as we would prefer to hear it).
> >> >
> >> >Hence now we have, for example, kicks that sound nothing like the real
> >think
> >> >- where you had a "koomphhh" or "doomphhh" to start with, the
"standard"

> >> is

> >> >to make it sound more like a "thmp" or "dhmp" (pardon my "technical"

> >> >terminology). Gating, compression, EQ, even if not necessary to fix

> >> >recording problems, have become a means to not just make the mix fit

> >> >together, but alter the sound to what has become the radio standard.

> >Much

> >> >of it sounds great for what it is, but it isn't about accurate

recording

> >> >anymore, and that makes it hyper-dependant on popular trends rather

than

> >> >audiology.

> >> >

> >> >Regards,

> >> >Dedric

> >> >

> >> >On 4/13/06 11:53 PM, in article 443f38eb\$1@linux, "gene lennon"

> >> ><glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

> >> >

> >> >>

> >> >> So I recognize my own prejudices, I think I clearly see the new

trends,

> >> but

> >> >> I don't prefer the new sound. I have no doubt that for many

listeners

> >> now

> >> >> and most in the future I will be from "The school of the outdated

> >sound."

> >> >>

> >> >> gene

> >> >>

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

> >> >>>

> >> >>> Gene,

> >> >>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW

> >"nostalgic"

> >> >>> sound thing.

> >> >>>

> >> >>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as

> I

> >> watched

> >> >>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity,

> >newer

> >> >> sounding

> >> >>> DAW technology.

> >> >>>

> >> >>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers

> who

> >> ears

> > >> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
 > > >>
 > > >> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The
 > > year
 > > >> 1982
 > > >> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI
 > > mixer..Fine..
 > > >> The
 > > >> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
 > > thinking
 > > >> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
 > > instruments
 > > >> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
 > > sound..
 > > >>
 > > >> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled
 > > vocals
 > > >> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
 > > >>
 > > >> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the
 > > magic
 > > >> was
 > > >> about to occur!! Out comes the Putec(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
 > > DBX160..2
 > > >> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng
 > > again,
 > > >> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,
 > > witha
 > > >> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 > > >>
 > > >> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site
 > > priased
 > > >> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND,
 > > we
 > > lawed
 > > >> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not
 warm
 > > enough,
 > > >> not dull , or muddy enough..
 > > >> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on
 > > every
 > > >> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad
 > > as
 > > well
 > > >> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box)
 unless

> > they
 > > >> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
 > > >> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
 > > >> Bomb factory)....
 > > >>
 > > >> So, like magic, companies pour massive resources to reclaim the
 glories
 > > days
 > > >> with the birth of the "Vintage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is)
 > to
 > > make
 > > >> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, all in
 > >all..Make
 > > >> the
 > > >> mixes sound like 1975!!!
 > > >>
 > > >> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by
 > Pro
 > > Tools
 > > >> HD and Nuendo, Sonar there's a shift occurring in the "Holy-Grail "
 > > >> RECORD-SOUND...
 > > >> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today
 > >having
 > > >> NO
 > > >> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get the 1975" sound, we
 > >have
 > > >> the
 > > >> High-Fidelity DAW sound in all its glory!! ..Yipee!!
 > > >>
 > > >> Still, the old guard continues to hold its thumb on the DAW market
 > >and
 > > >> keep
 > > >> driving manufacturers to making more and more vintage plugins. But,
 > >every
 > > >> now and then a product like Ozone's Izotope comes along (and
 others)
 > > that
 > > >> challenge the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
 > > >>
 > > >> Today kids are brought on the Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect
 > to
 > > hear
 > > >> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
 > > >>
 > > >> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
 > > >> Tankersly(I
 > > >> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vintage engineers) will continue to push
 > to

> >> have
> >> >>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to
fight
> >> DAW
> >> >>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss
> >market
> >> >>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with today's DAW.
> >> >>>
> >> >>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the
> >curent
> >> >> state
> >> >>> of very high fidelity that's afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,
> >Paris
> >> >>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
> >> >>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and
> >Brightosund
> >> >>> with bottom..So be it..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192
> >converters.
> >> >>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's
> >nice
> >> >>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavy bottom sound with my EMu
> >converters.
> >> >> Let's
> >> >>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
> >> >>>
> >> >>
> >> >
> >>
> >
> >
> >
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Jesse Skeens](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 04:40:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>Everyone is making good points in this discussion, but remember, unless
we
>are producing film soundtracks, (or similar), our sounds, be it music, voice

>or fx, are mostly going to be heard on an MP3 device of some sort, (player

>or radio), at least until the new generation of HiDef players are released,

>and then we are going to have the format wars starting all over again.
>No matter what equipment we use, the end result, in real terms, is MP3,

(or
>MP4).

It's all relative though. A great analog mix converted to mp3 is going to sound a lot better still than a crappy digital one. Although you do lose quality going to mp3, the essence of the original recording will still be there. Mp3's do not make all mixes on a level playing field.

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Reality check
Posted by [JD](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 05:03:32 GMT

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

Well it's kind of funny, a similar discussion is going on at <http://www.da7.com/>. The thread is titled, So much for 2". I think some of you will find it interesting, and have a few laughs. I personally think it shows the ignorance being proliferated, possibly from the PT community. It's a lot of "I heard"s. In other words, somebody told me what to think.

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

>I track with Paris with folks looking over my shoulder all the time. It's
>a matter of knowing what to do and how to do it. My system is very stable.

>

>As far as financial concerns go, yes, I stick with Paris because of
>financial concerns. If I had the money, there is not doubt at all that I'd
>be tracking to a pair of synced 2" 16 track machines and an API legacy
>console.

>

>Different strokes ;o)

>

>Deej

>"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote in message [news:443ff4c0\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:443ff4c0$1@linux...)

>>

>> Hi All,

>>

>> I am a former Paris user who still use Paris now and then, especially
when

>> I remix old songs recorded in Paris. I gave up in favour of Soundscape
>which

>> I truly love.

>>

>> when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left to desire.
It

>> nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT,
>Soundscape,

>> Nuendo, Samplitude etc.
>>
>> I have a fairly large Paris setup and as much magic as it has it is quite
>> unreliable compared to the other systems.
>> For example: Paris can sometimes (randomly) add strange DC offset to the
>> files. It can depending on heat cause clicks. Aux leakage. Just to mention

>Also,
>> what is by some perceived as warmth, sounds to me like a bit clouded
>midrange.
>> I have recorded a fair amount of classical choirs in both Paris, Soundscape
>> and Nuendo. In this genre there is simply no competition at all. My
>Soundscape
>> converters (Apogee) simply kills Paris in clarity and detail. OTOH with
>pop/rock,
>> especially acoustic pop/rock (live drums), Paris can sound a bit more
>exciting
>> than the others.
>>
>> Last but not least, sound aside Paris is a dinosaur. The routing options
>> leave A LOT to desire. The I/O flexibility is back to the stone age
>compared
>> to newer systems. The non-sample accurate editing is a PITA. Lack of
>professional
>> I/O options. Very rudimentary handling of native plugins, especially in
>stereo.
>> No bussing possibilities. No VST/DX on master bus. No delay compensation.
>> etc. ect...
>>
>> IMHO most people who are sticking to Paris are doing it for financial
>reasons.
>> Given the very low price the SH systems are going for, the price vs. sound
>> performance ratio is amazing, compared to other DSP-based system. In a
>>true
>> professional environment with clients hanging over your shoulder, the
>compromises
>> are just to big, all IMO of course.
>>
>> Just my 2 cents.
>>
>> Babu
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >Of course not, you just
>> >have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
>> >and it works great for classical.
>> >
>> >That's the beauty of it. It works either way. There is an issue with

the
 >> D/A
 >> >converters and jitter when using the Paris clock, but with an external
 >clock
 >> >I've never thought it sounded anything other than what I wanted it to
 >sound.
 >> >result.....however, this is blasphemy and I have to immediately jack
 the
 >> >submix faders into the stratosphere so I can hear all that crappy
 >distortion
 >> >that I like.
 >> >
 >> >;O)
 >> >
 >> >
 >> >
 >> >
 >> >"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote in message news:443f4acc\$1@linux...
 >> >>
 >> >> One myth I would like to dispel is that Paris sounds muddy, vintage,
 >> >> analog or less detailed than PT's.
 >> >>
 >> >> It's all in how hard you hit it.
 >> >>
 >> >> Had a conversation with SSC years ago about using Paris for
 >> >> classical and he really ground on me hard to try it and compare it
 to
 >> >> Sonic Solutions. Sonic has always been the gold standard for
 >> >> classical, and honestly I thought he was full of it, but I tried it,
 >using
 >> >> the same source material. He was right, it was actually better than
 >> >> Sonic on a 70-piece orchestra. Some of you have heard that CD.
 >> >> Did it sound "vintage" or muddy to you? Of course not, you just
 >> >> have to treat Paris like any other DAW, and don't push it too hard
 >> >> and it works great for classical. An orchestra recorded with the
 >> >> just 2 of the best mics in the world (DPA / B&K) the best pre
 >> >> (no tubes please!) and a great convertor is the ultimate test for
 >> >> clarity. One little loss of anything and the whole things turns to
 >> >> crap. It must be eq'ed and mastered to perfection, but if it is, it
 >> >> sounds like you are in the room with the orchestra.
 >> >>
 >> >> Paris works extremely well on an orchestra and I can tell you that
 >> >> unless you push the levels the sound is as real, detailed, open and
 >> >> clear as I have ever heard.
 >> >> Personally, I think Paris murders PT's on orchestras. The clarity
 >> >> and lack of distortion, even on the upper harmonics of high violin
 >> >> notes, is really better and the soundstage and imaging is terrific.
 >> >>
 >> >> Try not hitting Paris so hard in the mixer, push the submix masters

>> >> all the way up, and listen to the audio get nice and pristine.
>> >>
>> >> DC
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.
Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 15:40:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Man, I'm out of town for a few days and look at what I miss!
;-)
Rod
"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>The fact that this (PT/Paris debate, ad naseum) is actually even still a

>discussion after Paris being "dead" for this long says a whhhooole lot about

>Paris, dunnit?
>What a waste, thanks Creative, for your lack of vision :(
>
>AA
>
>
>"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message news:443fe185@linux...
>>I think you've misinterpreted that anyone is saying that one approach is

>>better than another.
>> On the contrary, this is just an observation in how we choose our
>> preferences, and the fact that
>> currently available technology significantly exceeds what was available

>> 40, 30, 20 and even 10 years ago.
>> Recording is about capturing audio - period. It's production, mixing,
and
>> the concept of creating listener appeal
>> in the music side of recording that has used it creatively. There isn't

>> anything wrong with that, but recording has always
>> been at the mercy of, and influenced by the available technology. It

>> isn't a platform war, and never was -
>> just a constant attempt to improve each element of the chain within the

>> budgets we have available.
>>
>> I once tested recording a vocal with a binaural head, test measuring
>> system. It sucked for artistic and listening pleasure,
>> but was incredibly realistic. Maybe that just goes to show that what

>> entertains us artistically doesn't necessarily benefit
>> from reality. There's nothing wrong with running a mix down to a 4-track

>> cassette deck if that's what floats your
>> boat creatively.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedric
>>
>>
>> "JD" <no@nospam.com> wrote in message news:443fdb4\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Everybody's got an opinion. Here we go with the PT is better than Paris

>>> stuff
>>> again. I guess this gives us something to talk about, but folks, we're

>>> all
>>> being goaded and bated here.
>>>
>>> This is what is wrong with the record industry. There is not enough

>>> diversity
>>> in sound and music styling these days. The whole cookie cutter approach

>>> to
>>> everything really sucks. That's why the record industry was in so much

>>> trouble,
>>> five Britney Spears, Spice Girls doesn't cut it for very long. Just

>>> because
>>> a new sound comes along, the old sound shouldn't become null and void.

>>> There
>>> should be room for everything. In other words, don't follow the
>>> followers,
>>> and maybe you'll get noticed. If everybody used PT the things would
be
>>> more
>>> boring than they already are!
>>>

>>> The demographic for the record companies is, 13 to 25, so the day you

>>> turn

>>> 26 your null and void??? No music geared to a 26, 36, or 46 year old???

>>> How stupid! Do you really think that a 16 year old would think, yuck,

>>> this

>>> music sucks, this wasn't recorded on a PT system! This music is

>>> unacceptable!

>>> No, they listen to the song!!!! The song is what sells them. variety

>>> is good when it comes to sound and production. Both sounds should be

>>> acceptable!

>>> But then again this post really wasn't about sound, now was it!

>>>

>>> LaMont, if you like PT better cool. Keep chasing your tail dude, your

>>> sure

>>> to end up in the same place!

>>>

>>>

>>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>>>> Good post, LaMont

>>>>

>>>>--

>>>> Martin Harrington

>>>> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>>>>

>>>> "LaMont" <jjdpro@aameritech.net> wrote in message

>>>> news:443f2d4d\$1@linux...

>>>>

>>>>> Gene,

>>>>> Thank you very much for "speaking: the truth about this whole DAW

>>>>> "nastalgic"

>>>>> sound thing.

>>>>>

>>>>> Let me just state that I've held my tongue for the last 5 years as

>>>>> I

>>>>> watched

>>>>> the DAW proaudio market "Hyjack" forward thinking , new fedelity, newer

>>>>>

>>>>> sounding

>>>>> DAW technology.

>>>>>

>>>>> The DAW market has been held "ransom" to the "old' guard Engineers

>>>>> who

>>>>>

>>>>> ears

>>>>> are trained to hear "un-natural" de-emphasis", muddled up recordings.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> I remember my very first recording session as a guitar player. The
 year
 >>>
 >>>>> 1982
 >>>>> as I remember recording my tracks to 2 inch Otari MTR, MCI mixer..Fine..
 >>>
 >>>>> The
 >>>>> sound was nice, clear just the way I recorded it. But, remember
 >>>>> thinking
 >>>>> "This does sound like a record" Hummmm... After all the other
 >>>>> instruments
 >>>>> were push up in the mix ,along with the vocals, stillnot a record
 >>>>> sound..
 >>>>>
 >>>>> In other works, where is the mudied drums? the thudy bass? the muddled
 >>>
 >>>>> vocals
 >>>>> that I heard since I was 4 years old??? where was this sound??
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Well, we hen attended the mix session, I soon found out that, the magic
 >>>
 >>>>> was
 >>>>> about to occur!! Out comes the Putec(s),the 1176s,LA2(s) GAtes,
 >>>>> DBX160..2
 >>>>> hours later they had that record sound..Hummm...I started thinkng
 >>>>> again,
 >>>>> "Man, the sound of 30ips Ampex 456 tape was big, vivid, wide, open,

 >>>>> witha
 >>>>> ting og high end fidelity..hummmm This was not the record sound..
 >>>>>
 >>>>> So here we are in 1997-98-99.PARis. The pro Engineers on this site

 >>>>> priased
 >>>>> it for it's "easy ability" to get that record sound!! wow!!! AND,
 we
 >>>
 >>>>> lawed
 >>>>> every oter digital recorder mixer for being toDigital...Not warm
 >>>
 >>>>> enough,
 >>>>> not dull , or muddy enough..
 >>>>> This Pro Engineer-Producer crowd wined,screemed, bitched, moaned on

 >>>>> every
 >>>>> forum that the current state of DAW's (namely Protools) mix was bad

as
>>>
>>>> well
>>>> as most plugins...Even more, they could not mix ITB(In the Box) unless
>>>
>>>> they
>>>> has software emulations of their beloved (OLD) compressors EQ,
>>>> Verbs.(UAD,MCDSP,
>>>> Bomb factory)....
>>>>
>>>> So, like magic, companies pour massive resouces to reclaim the glorys
>>> days
>>>> with the birth of the "Vinatage Plug ins). Their purpose was(is) to

>>>> make
>>>> your mixes"duller"=warmer, more professional(sit right, al in all..Make
>>>
>>>> the
>>>> mixes sound like 1975!!!
>>>>
>>>> Now in 2006 the "what I call" modern sound of DAWS, being lead by Pro
>>>
>>>> Tools
>>>> HD and Nuedno, Sonar there's a shift occuring in the "Holy-Grail "
>>>> RECORD-SOUND...
>>>> With Garage bands, rap artist, Rock bands, Soul singers of today having
>>> NO
>>>> prior knowledge,nor the Formal training to 'get he 1975" sound, we
have
>>>
>>>> the
>>>> High-Fedelivery DAW sound in all it'sglory!! ..Yipee!!
>>>>
>>>> Still, the old guard continues to hold it's thumb on the DAW market
and
>>>
>>>> keep
>>>> driving manufactures to making more and more vintage plugins. But,

>>>> every
>>>> now and then a product like Ozone's Izatope comes along (and others)

>>>> that
>>>> challeng the old "muddy up the mix crowd).
>>>>
>>>> Today kids are brought onthe Pro_Tools(Mix & HD) sound. They expect
to
>>>

>>>>> hear
>>>>> that sound. they have no idea on how to get a 1975 sound..
>>>>>
>>>>> So, I've said all the above to say: Let's move on!!Yes , the Brian
>>>>> Tankersly(I
>>>>> adore), Nuendo endorsers,vinatge engineers) will continue to push to

>>>>> have
>>>>> all of their 1960,79, & 80 hardware as a plugin and continue to fight
>>> DAW
>>>>> companies to to fix summing buses or event new a new summing buss
>>>>> market
>>>>> segment to ensure they et the 1975 sound with todays DAW.
>>>>>
>>>>> For me,they can have the 1975 sound. I'm moving onward with the cureent
>>>
>>>>> state
>>>>> of very high fidelity thats afforded me in PT HD And Nuendo..yes,

>>>>> Paris
>>>>> is still in my rig, but I will no longer
>>>>> fight mixes to get the 1975 sound..If the mixes are nice and
>>>>> Brightosund
>>>>> with bottom..So beit..I love the way PT HD sounds with the 192
>>>>> converters.
>>>>> Very nice full-spectrum sound ,with a nice top end. I love Nuendo's

>>>>> nice
>>>>> wide -spacious,clear open , heavey bottom sound with my EMu converters.
>>>
>>>>> Let's
>>>>> evolve past 1975..Pleaseeeeeeeeeee!!!!
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time
>>>>>>primarily
>>>>>>for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still
>>>>>>sounds
>>>>>>different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still
>>>>> has
>>>>>>more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more

>>>>>aggressive
>>>>>when you push the gain stages.
>>>>>
>>>>>So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other
DAWS
>>>>> because
>>>>>its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it
is
>>>
>>>>>closer
>>>>>to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30
>>>>>years?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely
>>> a
>>>>>learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.
>>>>>
>>>>>In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain
>>>>>unnamed),
>>>>>I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was

>>>>>big
>>>>>and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good
and
>>>>> not
>>>>>at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number
>>>>> of
>>>>>recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding

>>>>>DAWS
>>>>>as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows and more
>>>>>important
>>>>>it is the sound he likes! Yikes!! Compressed to a dynamic range of

>>>>>about
>>>>>10db and very little sense of depth, space or stereo width.
>>>>>
>>>>>Music may be universal but we all know it comes with cultural bias.
How
>>>>> many
>>>>>American teens would choose to listen to a steady diet of microtonal
>>>>>music?
>>>>>Might as well serve up a big plate of Haggis... And it not just teens.
>>>
>>>>>Labels
>>>>>work the exact same way. If someone has a hit record that sounds
>>>>>crappy,

>>>>>all the labels want the same crappy sound.
>>>>>
>>>>>Suddenly I am feeling very old. Fashions change taste changes but I
>>>>>thought
>>>>>good sound was forever. Perhaps not so. As a producer who still has
at
>>>
>>>>>least
>>>>>one toe in the current market, I need to have some awareness of the
>>>>>realities
>>>>>of the market and the "new sound" is the new sound.
>>>>>
>>>>>My personal taste has not changed. For most projects that I foresee

>>>>>myself
>>>>>working on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made
>>>>>decisions
>>>>>in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more

>>>>>trendy
>>>>>"Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive
PT
>>>
>>>>>sound".
>>>>>(Insert appropriate emoticon).
>>>>>
>>>>>Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the

>>>>>Waves
>>>>>SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound
>>>>> of
>>>>>better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like
and
>>> I
>>>>>can experiment with a mix of the two styles.
>>>>>
>>>>> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some

>>>>> people
>>>>>may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own
>>>>>preferences
>>>>>are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way.
I
>>>>>don't
>>>>>see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
>>>>>fighting
>>>>>over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.
>>>>>

>>>>>And don't forget.the cyclical nature of fashion almost guarantees that
>>> one
>>>>>day we will once again be "in".
>>>>>
>>>>>Gene
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>
>I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
><http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>
>
>
