Subject: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by excelav on Wed, 21 Dec 2005 19:51:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

/>
> > > ...they have nothing to experiment with... ...so, statistical, you
must be
> > a
> > > real intelligent person... ...hmm...
> > >
> > > erlilo
> > >
> > > "DJ" <

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Morgan on Wed, 21 Dec 2005 20:11:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

, reinsert all of the
other
> > > > drives
> > > > and then reboot.
> > > >
> > > > Also, with as many PCI cards as I've got, (3 x RME's and 4 x UAD-1's
in
> > a
> > > > Magma) the IRQ less than equal BSOD can rear it's ugly head. The
trick
> > is
> > > > to
> > > > turn off the Magma (or pull the PCI cards from the mobo slots),
reboot
> > > > until
> > > > you get the s

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 01:03:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

br />
> >
> > .....I mean, the AMD 64 4200 x 2 is also a socket 939 and, of
> > course, so is the mobo socket, so barring a bios snafu (entirely
possible)
> > mighn't this be possible? It would seem that the AMD 64 4200 X2 would be

> > faster since the cores are running at 2200 MHz per processor, but the
> > Opteron has 2 x 1MB L2 cache and an unlocked multiplier (if accessable
> > from
> > the bios) and from what I hear, a better formulation of silicon.
> >
> > Hmmmmmm.....man I'm tempted. Why don't y'all pass the plate and
> > send
> > me one of these?
> >
> > ;oD
> >
> >
>
>Hi,
Merry Christmas to all of you although a little bit early...
Regarding the intrconnection of 4 cards .
I connected from like in the manual from f

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by DC on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 02:03:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

orld is full of selfish assholes! It really sucks!
>
>I really dislike people that think they are entitled to take freedom from
>others, or rip people off!
>
>
>"Mark McDermott" <mark@stateofwail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Holy Crap!
>>
>>I hope that I don't happen to be humming or whistling someone else's tune
>>if I'm walking down the street past one of these *&#&rs from PRS.
>>
>>Better stay on this side of the pond where only BMI and ASCAP send Paulie
>>Walnuts out to collect!
>>
>>"JB" <no@mail.com> wrote:
>>> http://www.macclesfield-express.co.uk/news/s/207/207169_its_ a_fiddle.html
>>>
>>>WTF!
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>Soon you'll have to pay up when you have a song stuck in your head!

"Cujo" <

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 15:26:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

>>> http://www.wired.com/news/mac/0,2125,68501,00.html?tw=wn_sto ry_related
>>>>
>>>>http://osx86project.org/
>>>
>>
>Hey Dimitrios,

It doesn't matter how the computer sees them... hang you MEC's off of
A and D (assuming you only have two interfaces) and you should be good
to go.

David.

Dimitrios wrote:
> Dear Rod,
> Thanks for replying.
> Paris sees the card as follows assuming we see the cards inside PC naming
> 1 the one that is close to agp card and 4 the furtherst away.
> 1 card in pc = card B in Paris
> 2 card in pc = card C in Paris
> 3 card in pc = card D in Paris
> 4 card in pc = card A in Paris
>
> Can you somehow describe how you would interconnect them ?
> If I have connected them "wrongly" why does Paris work ?
>
> Regards,
> Dimitrios
>
> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:
>
>>Hook the up as Paris sees them. If I'm understanding you correctly, however,
>>it will be the same hookup , assuming cards C and D are in order below B,
>>with A on the Bottom.
>>Rod
>>
>>
>>
>>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> w

rconnection of 4 cards .
>>>>I connected from like in the manual from first card (slot1) to the last
>>>
>>>one
>>>
>>>>(slot 5)
>>>>I detect though that card 1 (slot1) is identified as card B, card 4 (slot
>>>>5) is identified as card A (main card)
>>>>So due to someone's last post here should I connect as Paris sees the
cards
>>>>or as I see them inside my computer?
>>>>Paris works ok but maybe I am risking or could have more stable setup
(nothing
>>>>major though)
>>>>Regards,
>>>>Dimitrios
>>>
>>As long as all the cards are connected correctly (10 pin cables
straight across and 16 pin cables crossed), and the Paris software
plays back on all submixes, it doesn't matter.

I simply start at one end of the EDS cards and stagger the 16 pin
ribbons.. bottom (first card) right to second left, second right to
third left, third right to fourth left, fouth right to fifth left,
fifth right to first left. I then find the master (A) card. One that
is done I finde the order of the remaining cards (which it sounds like
you have already done) and make sure I have one interface on the first
and last card.

So far, it has always worked.

David.

Dimitrios wrote:

> Hey David,
> Maybe I did not made things clear.
> It is not Mecs where to get attached.
> I have three mecs hanging over card A, B, and D.
> It is the interconnecting cables over pci cards thatI am worried about.
> Regards,
> Dimitrios
> EK Sound <spamnot.info@eksoundNO.com> wrote:
>
>>Hey Dimitrios,

>>
>>It doesn't matter how the computer sees them... hang you MEC's off of
>>A and D (assuming you only have two interfaces) and you should be good
>>to go.
>>
>>David.
>>
>>Dimitrios wrote:
>>
>>>Dear Rod,
>>>Thanks for replying.
>>>Paris sees the card as follows assuming we see the cards inside PC naming
>>>1 the one that is close to agp card and 4 the furtherst away.
>&g

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Tony Benson on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 17:33:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAK
KKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiii
gAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAK
KKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiii
gAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAK
KKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiii
gAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAK
KKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiii
gAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAK
KKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiii
gAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAK
KKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiii
gAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAK
KKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiii
gAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKACiiigAoooooAKKKKA

CiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAK
KKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiii
gAoooAKKYEAlaTLZYBSNxxgZ6DoDyee/HoKfQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUA
FFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAU
UUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRR
RQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFF
ABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUA
FFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAU
UUUAFFFFABRRRQAUUUUAFFFFABRRRQAU

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by excelav on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 17:55:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

CiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiii
gAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAK
KKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiii
gAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAK
KKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiii
gAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAK
KKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiii
gAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKA
CiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAK
KKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoo
ooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiii
gAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKACiiigAoooAKKKKA
Ciii

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 20:45:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> driver is for WinXP.
>>
>> Erling
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i melding

>> news:43a3bb3e$1@linux...
>> > Major suckage. The VIA AGP driver gets corrupted whenever I insert my
>> > Matrox
>> > G450 PCI card. It's a repeatable situation. Now.....do I really
>> > need
>> > this driver? That is the question.
>> >
>> > Hmmmm.....
>> >
>> >
>> > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> > news:43a3b023@linux...
>> >> Yep!!!.....definitely an issue with teh VIA 4in1 driver. Damn!!! I
> hope
>> >> this isn't an incompatibility issue between the KT 800 and the Matrox
>> >> driver. I was sorta' thinking that this might be a friggin trainwreck.
>> >> The
>> >> G450 is a bit long in the tooth.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> >> news:43a3aac9$1@linux...
>> >> > Well.....no workee with the Magma aND IRQ assignments and
> getting
>> >> > squirrellier by the minute on current OS. I ghosted it and pulled
> the
>> >> > drive. Now I have got a brand new WD 80G 8MB cache formatted and I
>> >> installed
>> >> > Win XP. Immediate problems with my Matrox graphics cards right after
> I
>> >> > installed the VIA 4in1 drivers for the mobo. It's gonna be a
> hellacious
>> >> > weekend I'm afraid.
>> >> >
>> >> > ;o{
>> >> >
>> >> > "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> > news:43a39439$1@linux...
>> >> > >
>> >> > > "Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>> >> > > >You posted good vibes 'before` getting the Magma in and Paris
>> > running?
>> >> > > >Oh man, now you've done it.....
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Hehe... [sni

gger snigger]
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>
>Thats one of the good things about 1820M. it's hardware effects!! so you can
use the effects in monitoring while recording.
Hope it helps
Jorsi
"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> skrev i en meddelelse
news:43aae610$1@linux...
> Hey Mic,
>
> Question: I understand the onboard DSP fx don't work in hi-res recording
> modes, but can you still patch to an outboard fx unit with the auxes, so a
> singer, for example, could have some verb in the cans?
>
> Bill
>
> "Mic Cross" <crzymnmchl@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:43a99d44$1@linux...
>>
>> Hi Chris, bought a 1820M a while ago - it lasted about 5
>> minutes which is when I ran their s/w - didn't think anything
>> could be worse than the 9652 s/w :-) Gonna plug it back in after
>> all the good things you say. Is it just the mic pres that make
>> it good? What about output? I have got used to the Central
>> Station. Is the 1820M cleaner etc? Does it make sense to take
>> sp/dif out of the 1820M and into the Central Station? Where can
>> I get EmulatorX s/w for $100? TIA,
>>
>> Mic.
>
>Thanks Erlilo !
Thats what exactly needed to know.
Regards,
Dimitrios

"erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote:
>

>
>The only thing I found here now, is some writings from earlier. If it =
>will help, I don't know, but he

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 20:54:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

re it comes:
>
>-The card assignments do not affect the cabling. The 10 pin is a =
>straight across connection, and the 16 pin crisscrosses -always. The =
>last card connects back to the first card, again crossing over the same
=
>as if the cards were next to each --other.
>
>-There is no need to be concerned about how Paris "sees" the order of =
>the cards. It does not affect the cables.
>
>
>-Regards,
>-Brian T
>----------
>1) Are the eds cards connected with the
>criss-cross ribbon cables AND one
>clock cable inside your computer?
>Double check the pins. They sometimes are
>out of line without noticing.
>
>2) BNC connecting MEC A wordclock out
>to Mec B wordclock in?
>
>3) If 1 and 2 are right, make sure submix B in the
>Group Master Section is set to Card B not virtual
>or anything else.
>
>The mix of submix card A and B should be audible at
>mL & mR as well as ML & MR outs off Submix A
>Master section in the patchbay.
>Hope this helps,
>Tom Bruhl
>----------
>I seems to remember there was something about it in the manual, so I =
>looked, so here you go: The card that's nearest the AGP card is allways
=
>card A, followed by B etc., as far as I can understand from the manual.
>

>Hope this will help and a merry Christmas, Dimitros.
>
>Erling
>
>
>
>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> skrev i melding =
>news:43aaf8a8$1@linux...
>>=20
>> Thanks Erling,
>> My real question though is not how to connect ABC and D but which =
>cards are
>> ABCD the way Paris sees them or the cards in a row...
>> Regards,
>> Dimitrios
>>=20
>> "erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote:
>>>Here's some pictures Aaron sent to the group some years ago, about how
=
>to
>> do=20
>>>it.
>>>
>>>Erling
>>>
>>>"Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> skrev i melding=20
>>>news:43aae4f1$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> D
>>>> Here's a diagram. See the 16 pins are the same, no matter which way
=
>you
>>=20
>>>> think
>>>> about it. The 10 pin WC cables are a little different.
>>>> No spaghetti though.

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Jamie K on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 22:27:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

br />
both very good.....better than the Waves REN de-esser which I also have here. I recently bought an SPL (hardware) deesser. IMO, this is a much more natural sounding de-esser than any frequency based compressor. I have heard that someone made a plugin of this, but I haven't heard it.

Deej

"David Posey" <crosscreekrecording@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:43aabe66$1@linux...
>
> I had done a search looking for a desesser plugin but have come up with
nothing.
> Any help would appreciated.
> David PHey thanks Jorsi. Right now I'm pretty happy not using either the Matrox
driver or the VIA AGP driver. I'm not having any problems at all and after
going through such grief, my thinking on this is why add two drivers to the
mix if I'm doing OK without them? I know that doesn't sound much like
something I would do, but in this case, I'm just tired of ****'ing around
with this computer. It's working exactly as I had hoped now so why bother?
;o)
Deej
"Jorsi" <studios@greennet.gl> wrote in message news:43ab0515@linux...
> I have seen that you can get an patch for your A8V so you can use the
> matrox-drivers in matrox forum, all you have do is go to the forum ask for
> the patch and they will send it to your email-address.
> hope it helps
> Jorsi
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i en meddelelse
> news:43a45564@linux...
> > Life seems to be good without the VIA drivers, t least on the AGP. Looks
> > like the AGP is OK and the cards are OK. I was worried that I might be
> > having a hardware problem but life is good without the VIA drivers.
> > I didn't Ghost before I loaded these drivers (hey!!!!..... these
were
> > the mobo drivers!!!!.....what could go wrong ? ;o) so I had to reformat
> > the
> > new system drive and load Windows XP again. I've got both the Matrox
video
> > cards working nicely now and I'm Ghosting the system drive as we speak.
> >
> > I'm thinking of loading the Matrox universal driver, though I have found
> > the
>

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Tony Benson on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 23:04:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

br />
> >> >> > installed the VIA 4in1 drivers for the mobo. It's gonna be a

> > hellacious
> >> >> > weekend I'm afraid.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > ;o{
> >> >> >
> >> >> > "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:43a39439$1@linux...
> >> >> > >
> >> >> > > "Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
> >> >> > > >You posted good vibes 'before` getting the Magma in and Paris
> >> > running?
> >> >> > > >Oh man, now you've done it.....
> >> >> > >
> >> >> > > Hehe... [snigger snigger]
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
>
>So, Jamie, you think I just make this stuff up? I'm some platform hater with
no numbers or knowledge to back up what I say? Remember, in addition to what
I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network admin and developer.
And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about this urban
legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a) the G5 is a fabulous
RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made in kernel
development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly mult-threaded
environments.

http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436

Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel does and
note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower than the same
hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.

http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/

Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and about the guy
who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the supermodel who
banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written on the hotel
bathroom mirror . . .

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>Hey Thad,
>
>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd be curious

>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>TCB wrote:
>> The G5 is a fine RISC chip. The core technology is also what's in most
of
>> the supercomputer gamer consoles as well. However, many people have been
>> very surprised at the penalty in performance running OS X vs the couple
of
>> GNU\Linux flavors available for the chip. If the reports I hear are true
>> there is a lot of, erm, "optimization" that could be done in OS X to make
>> it snappier. Why they don't is beyond me, but the evidence is pretty hard
>> to argue against.
>>
>> What's the state of memory/drive technology in OS X these days? That could
>> have a lot to do with it as well.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>>Morgan <morganp@ntplx.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>Hi James,
>>>>Our Buddy Pete Leoni figured this one out long
>>>

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by excelav on Thu, 22 Dec 2005 23:35:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> default Matrox drivers that is in XP to be a bit less troublesome
because
> > it
> > doesn't laod all of the extra Power Desk features, none of which I use.
> >

> > (Yawn.....was up until 4AM jacking around with this
thing.....need
> > coffee.....).
> >
> >
> > "erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote in message news:43a3e23c$1@linux...
> >> Doug, this seems to again be a long story for you. Have you tested with
> > the
> >> new Matrox G450 certified drivers from sept.05. I had no luck with the
> >> new
> >> driver on my sForce Epox 9NDA3+ board but maybe VIA will eat it? The
new
> >> driver is for WinXP.
> >>
> >> Erling
> >>
> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i melding
> >> news:43a3bb3e$1@linux...
> >> > Major suckage. The VIA AGP driver gets corrupted whenever I insert my
> >> > Matrox
> >> > G450 PCI card. It's a repeatable situation. Now.....do I really
> >> > need
> >> > this driver? That is the question.
> >> >
> >> > Hmmmm.....
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> >> > news:43a3b023@linux...
> >> >> Yep!!!.....definitely an issue with teh VIA 4in1 driver. Damn!!! I
> > hope
> >> >> this isn't an incompatibility issue between the KT 800 and the
Matrox
> >> >> driver. I was sorta' thinking that this might be a friggin
trainwreck.
> >> >> The
> >> >> G450 is a bit long in the tooth.
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> >> >> news:43a3aac9$1@linux...
> >> >> > Well.....no workee with the Magma aND IRQ assignments and
> > getting
> >> >> > squirrellier by the minute on current OS. I ghosted it and pulled
> > the
> >> >> > drive. Now I have got a brand new WD 80G 8MB cache formatted and I
> >> >> installed
> >> >> > Win XP. Immediate problems with my Matrox graphics cards right

after
> > I

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 00:29:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ater--XP and OS X are but minor variations on

>> the
>> very same theme. The wonderful world of GNU\Linux, where I am in control
>> of my own computer, as another symphony entirely.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>>So Thad, are you saying you don't care for Apple, OSX and the mac in
>>>general
>>
>>>? You're being so vague. ;>)
>>>
>>>I'll start my twelve step program right now, but I'm not guaranteeing
>>>anything!
>>>
>>>Hi, my name is Tony and I use a Mac.
>>>
>>>;>)
>>>
>>>Tony
>>>
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43aab7b1$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> This is a bit cryptic to me, but if Debian/Gnome is bad sex and
>>>> man'n'cheese
>>>> then OS X is erectile dysfunction and cold noodle soup.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "DC" <dc@spambillgates.org> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>Sheesh, yeah, you can get used to bad sex and mac n' cheese for
>>>>>dinner too...
>>>>>
>>>>>heh
>>>>>
>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Why on earth anyone would want a proprietary, bloated *nix on X86
>>>>>>processors
>>>>>>is completely and totally beyond me. You want audio? Install XP, it

>>>>>>works
>>>>>>great. You want every last drop of *nix scrumptiousness on planet earth
>>>>>with
>>>>>>the same hardware? www.debian.org and you won't owe Cupertino one thin
>>>> dime.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Come on in! The water's fine! Once you get used to being out of Big
>>>>>>Brother's
>>>>>>reach you'll love it!
>>>>>>
>>>>>>TCB
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>FYI, some interesting info about Mac OSX running on a PC.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> http://www.wired.com/news/mac/0,2125,68501,00.html?tw=wn_sto ry_related
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>http://osx86project.org/
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>Just got off the phone with Tom Freemen over at UA. The new 4.1 software
should be up for DL in a couple of hours.

This multiband slloks like it is going a bit beyond the usual crop of
multiband plugins and may actually be pretty useful. I sometimes use
multibands on bass but haven't really found any plugins ththat float my boat
for use on the mix bus (if it's my mix, I'd rather re-mix than use a
multiband) but this might actually be a sueful tool for outside work tat
can't be remixed.

I'm going to give the demo a twirl.

;o)Yeah that's great, but I read that when you go to hi-res (96K) the f/x are
not available. At that point can you use outboard f/x? Do the auxes still

work?

Bill

"Jorsi" <

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 00:30:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

a href="mailto:studios@greennet.gl" target="_blank">studios@greennet.gl> wrote in message
news:43ab08a8@linux...
> Thats one of the good things about 1820M. it's hardware effects!! so you
> can use the effects in monitoring while recording.
> Hope it helps
> Jorsi
> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> skrev i en meddelelse
> news:43aae610$1@linux...
>> Hey Mic,
>>
>> Question: I understand the onboard DSP fx don't work in hi-res recording
>> modes, but can you still patch to an outboard fx unit with the auxes, so
>> a singer, for example, could have some verb in the cans?
>>
>> Bill
>>
>> "Mic Cross" <crzymnmchl@comcast.net> wrote in message
>> news:43a99d44$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Hi Chris, bought a 1820M a while ago - it lasted about 5
>>> minutes which is when I ran their s/w - didn't think anything
>>> could be worse than the 9652 s/w :-) Gonna plug it back in after
>>> all the good things you say. Is it just the mic pres that make
>>> it good? What about output? I have got used to the Central
>>> Station. Is the 1820M cleaner etc? Does it make sense to take
>>> sp/dif out of the 1820M and into the Central Station? Where can
>>> I get EmulatorX s/w for $100? TIA,
>>>
>>> Mic.
>>
>>
>
>Thad, if you compare features, the 01x is really a full mixer, and could be
more versatile, whereas the Maudio seems more limited. Not to mention that
Yammy has a long history of making nice digital mixers and f/x etc.

Bill

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a9f162$1@linux...
>
> Hey guys,
>
> Thanks for all of the tips. I didn't know the options were so much more
> varied.
> I think I'll probably go for the M-Audio. Not too expensive, uses the
> Mackie
> protocol (should be more software/hardware agnostic) and very nicely is
> from
> the company that distributes Live so I'd guess support for my new most
> beloved
> app will be good. Tascam is a close second though, but thanks to everyone.
>
>
> TCB
>
> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hey all,
>>
>>I've been looking for a new audio interface, as my Aardvark Q10 has no
>>continuing
>>driver support. I'm kind of out of the loop these days, but a friend
>>suggested
>>that since I'm a SX boy and Yamaha is pimping SX as the best software for
>>use with mLan products, that the 01X might be a good idea.
>>
>>http://www.zzounds.com/item--YAM01X
>>
>>Any experiences, good or bad? I don't think I'd be using the mixer much,
>>it would mostly just be an audio

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 00:35:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

interface and a remote control device.
>
>>
>>Thanks,
>>
>>TCB
>Yes!
Hope it helps
Jorsi

"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> skrev i en meddelelse
news:43ab39b5@linux...
> Yeah that's great, but I read that when you go to hi-res (96K) the f/x are
> not available. At that point can you use outboard f/x? Do the auxes still
> work?
>
> Bill
>
> "Jorsi" <studios@greennet.gl> wrote in message news:43ab08a8@linux...
>> Thats one of the good things about 1820M. it's hardware effects!! so you
>> can use the effects in monitoring while recording.
>> Hope it helps
>> Jorsi
>> "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> skrev i en meddelelse
>> news:43aae610$1@linux...
>>> Hey Mic,
>>>
>>> Question: I understand the onboard DSP fx don't work in hi-res recording
>>> modes, but can you still patch to an outboard fx unit with the auxes, so
>>> a singer, for example, could have some verb in the cans?
>>>
>>> Bill
>>>
>>> "Mic Cross" <crzymnmchl@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>> news:43a99d44$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Hi Chris, bought a 1820M a while ago - it lasted about 5
>>>> minutes which is when I ran their s/w - didn't think anything
>>>> could be worse than the 9652 s/w :-) Gonna plug it back in after
>>>> all the good things you say. Is it just the mic pres that make
>>>> it good? What about output? I have got used to the Central
>>>> Station. Is the 1820M cleaner etc? Does it make sense to take
>>>> sp/dif out of the 1820M and into the Central Station? Where can
>>>> I get EmulatorX s/w for $100? TIA,
>>>>
>>>> Mic.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>http://www.rayzoon.com/jamstix_feat.html

This is absolutely the coolest thing since sliced bread. I've got it
happening right now using BDF as the sound engine, but it also has a very
good sounding sample set of it's own and or can be used with DFH as well.
Mic Cross turned me on to this about a week ago and I have become obsessed

with it.

;oPYou got a point there, but maybe it's a good idea to get the patch for
future XP re-install projects; as I've seen in this NG you do a lot of
tweeking with your stuff.
it's very inspiring to read all of your solutions.
Merry christmas
Jorsi
"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i en meddelelse
news:43ab3430$1@linux...
> Hey thanks Jorsi. Right now I'm pretty happy not using either the Matrox
> driver or the VIA AGP driver. I'm not having any problems at all and after
> going through such grief, my thinking on this is why add two drivers to
> the
> mix if I'm doing OK without them? I know that doesn't sound much like
> something I would do, but in this case, I'm just tired of ****'ing around
> with this computer. It's working exactly as I had hoped now so why bother?
> ;o)
> Deej
> "Jorsi" <studios@greennet.gl> wrote in message news:43ab0515@linux...
>> I have seen that you can get an patch for your A8V so you can use the
>> matrox-drivers in matrox forum, all you have do is go to the forum ask
>> for
>> the patch and they will send it to your email-address.
>> hope it helps
>> Jorsi
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i en meddelelse
>> news:43a45564@linux...
>> > Life seems to be good without the VIA drivers, t least on the AGP.
>> > Looks
>> > like the AGP is OK and the cards are OK. I was worried that I might be
>> > having a hardware problem but life is good without the VIA drivers.
>> > I didn't Ghost before I loaded these drivers (hey!!!!..... these
> were
>> > the mobo drivers!!!!.....what could go wrong ? ;o) so I had to
>> > reformat
>> > the
>> > new system drive and load Windows XP again. I've got both the Matrox
> video
>> > cards working nicely now and I'm Ghosting the system drive as we speak.
>> >
>> > I'm thinking of loading the Matrox universal driver, though I have
>&gt

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Jamie K on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 06:42:11 GMT

43aa6ea1$1@linux...
>
> Hi,
> Merry Christmas to all of you although a little bit early...
> Regarding the intrconnection of 4 cards .
> I connected from like in the manual from first card (slot1) to the last
one
> (slot 5)
> I detect though that card 1 (slot1) is identified as card B, card 4 (slot
> 5) is identified as card A (main card)
> So due to someone's last post here should I connect as Paris sees the
cards
> or as I see them inside my computer?
> Paris works ok but maybe I am risking or could have more stable setup
(nothing
> major though)
> Regards,
> Dimitrios.... and Deej turned me onto it a night ago, and I am becoming obsessed with
it. Once I get my personal business out of the way and set back up in my new
house (just closed on it today!) I'm _definitely_ going to dive in full
force with it.
Danke' Doug and Mic.. great find !

AA

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:43ab3cd5$1@linux...
> http://www.rayzoon.com/jamstix_feat.html
>
> This is absolutely the coolest thing since sliced bread. I've got it
> happening right now using BDF as the sound engine, but it also has a very
> good sounding sample set of it's own and or can be used with DFH as well.
> Mic Cross turned me on to this about a week ago and I have become obsessed
> with it.
>
> ;oP
>
>or...you rapscallion you.

On 23 Dec 2005 01:41:14 +1000, "Rod Lincoln"
<rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:

>
>You REBEL!
>;-)

>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>The 2400 is a good idea because it's got the same chip form factor. The
>2800
>>would require a new mobo and the whole point of this is to get this working
>>on my existing mobo that isn't meant to be used with the
>>Opteron.....first of all, so I don't have to reformat and reload all
>ov
>>my programs/drivers, second of all, so that I can be doing something totally
>>inappropriate.
>>
>>
>>;o)
>>
>>
>>"erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote in message news:43aa5f43$1@linux...
>>> .....what so?-o).... ....if you're first thinking these thoughts, why
>not
>>> think bigger? Opteron have a 2400 MHz too for socket 939, named 180. For
>>the
>>> socket 940 you can get a 2800 MHz for about 1500 boxes to use with a cheap
>>> Asus SK8N 70$ board, so the brain will have big problems to follow it
>up
>>> when it comes to speed;-).....
>>>
>> http://www.amd.com/us-en/Processors/ProductInformation/0,,30 _118_8825,00.htm
>>l
>>>
>>> Erling
>>>
>>>
>>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i melding
>>> news:43aa1971$1@linux...
>>> > .....drop one of these into my ASUS A8V-Deluxe 939 mobo and
>>see
>>> > what happens?
>>> >
>>> >
>> http://www.mwave.com/mwave/skusearch.hmx?SCriteria=BA22051&a mp;CartID=done&nextl
>>> > oc=
>>> >
>>> > .....I mean, the AMD 64 4200 x 2 is also a socket 939 and, of
>>> > course, so is the mobo socket, so barring a bios snafu (entirely
>>possible)
>>> > mighn't this be possible? It would seem that the AMD 64 4200 X2 would
>be
>>> > faster since the cores are running at 2200 MHz per processor, but the
>>> > Opteron has 2 x 1MB L2 cache and an unlocked multiplier (if accessable
>>> > from

>>> > the bios) and from what I hear, a better formulation of silicon.
>>> >
>>> > Hmmmmmm.....man I'm tempted. Why don't y'all pass the plate and
>>> > send
>>> > me one of these?
>>> >
>>> > ;oD
>>> >
>>> >
>>>
>>>
>>
>>dude, go back to bed :-) been up since 4 arghhhhh

rick wrote:
> or...you rapscallion you.
>
> On 23 Dec 2005 01:41:14 +1000, "Rod Lincoln"
> <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>You REBEL!
>>;-)
>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>
>>>The 2400 is a good idea because it's got the same chip form factor. The
>>
>>2800
>>
>>>would require a new mobo and the whole point of this is to get this working
>>>on my existing mobo that isn't meant to be used with the
>>>Opteron.....first of all, so I don't have to reformat and reload all
>>
>>ov
>>
>>>my programs/drivers, second of all, so that I can be doing something totally
>>>inappropriate.
>>>
>>>
>>>;o)
>>>
>>>
>>>"erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote in message news:43aa5f43$1@linux...
>>>
>>>>.....what so?-o).... ....if you're first thinking these thoughts, why
>>
>>not
>>

>>>>think bigger? Opteron have a 2400 MHz too for socket 939, named 180. For
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>>socket 940 you can get a 2800 MHz for about 1500 boxes to use with a cheap
>>>>Asus SK8N 70$ board, so the brain will have big problems to follow it
>>
>>up
>>
>>>>when it comes to speed;-).....
>>>>
>>>
>>> http://www.amd.com/us-en/Processors/ProductInformation/0,,30 _118_8825,00.htm
>>>I
>>>
>>>>Erling
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i melding
>>>>news:43aa1971$

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 16:15:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

>>>>>>
>>>>>>Morgan
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Hey Morgan! I think I smell some B.S. I'm having a hard time believing
>>>>
>>>>a
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Celeron could beat a G5, maybe an early 1.6 single processor with the
>>
>> slower
>>
>>>>>bus speed???, but I doubt it. I don't think Virginia Tech would have
>>
>> built
>>
>>>>>the 4th fastest super computer on the planet with G5s if G5 were slow.
>>
>>
>>>>Why
>>>>

>>>>
>>>>>don't you get the guy to post here. I think it would be interesting
to
>>>>
>>>>hear
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>about his findings.
>>>>>
>>>>>James
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>James McCloskey wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>FYI, some interesting info about Mac OSX running on a PC.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> http://www.wired.com/news/mac/0,2125,68501,00.html?tw=wn_sto ry_related
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>http://osx86project.org/
>>>>>>
>>"Brandon" <lwire98@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>Some of you guys use a popular distressor (hardware)
>what is a comparible software alternative?
>Thanks

I posted about a month ago, IIRC, that Voxengo's Voxformer
can get very close to a Distressor's characteristics... check it
out on their site - they have a demo you can try.

NeilYeah, that's what really speaks for the 01X--it has some pretty high end mixer
abilities. That said, as an ever more "in the box" musician I wonder how
much I'd actually use a lot of that. I used a Houston for a while and liked
it but ran into problems because a) I think Steinberg did a piss poor job
on supporting and b) it was really an SX only tool. I'd like something that
will work well with Live and not just SX and I also want something that will
let me do plug-in automation for all of those dub hits.

I'll be checking out all of the options and I'll report back what I find.
The advice was all good, though, and I appreciate it.

TCB

"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>Thad, if you compare features, the 01x is really a full mixer, and could

be
>more versatile, whereas the Maudio seems more limited. Not to mention that

>Yammy has a long history of making nice digital mixers and f/x etc.
>
>Bill
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43a9f162$1@linux...
>>
>> Hey guys,
>>
>> Thanks for all of the tips. I didn't know the options were so much more

>> varied.
>> I think I'll probably go for the M-Audio. Not too expensive, uses the

>> Mackie
>> protocol (should be more software/hardware agnostic) and very nicely is

>> from
>> the company that distributes Live so I'd guess support for my new most

>> beloved
>> app will be good. Tascam is a close second though, but thanks to everyone.
>>
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Hey all,
>>>
>>>I've been looking for a new audio interface, as my Aardvark Q10 has no

>>>continuing
>>>driver support. I'm kind of out of the loop these days, but a friend
>>>suggested
>>>that since I'm a SX boy and Yamaha is pimping SX as the best software
for
>>>use with mLan products, that the 01X might be a good idea.
>>>
>>>http://www.zzounds.com/item--YAM01X
>>>
>>>Any experiences, good or bad? I don't think I'd be using the mixer much,
>>>it would mostly just be an audio interface and a remote control device.
>>
>>>
>>>Thanks,

>>>
>>>TCB
>>
>
>TCB wrote:
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>Looking at the links, Tiger 10.4.1 on a G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7 is shown to
>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec is used. Holds its own (their
>>example, LightWave - more examples would be appreciated but that's not
>>their focus). I use LW so it's pertinent to me.
>
> That's not what I read. What I read is that OS X is disastrous at managing
> mutliple threads. Most, but not all, workstation apps use relatively few
> threads. Something like LW or AfterEffects will usually be only a few threads
> and the penalty for bad multi-threading will be minimal. Audio apps are usually
> more thread heavy than almost anything else that is "workstation" level work,
> so the consistently reported miserable performance with DP might make some
> sense.

I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time. Its
performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not "disastrous" in
real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is overstated
when it comes what I need in a studio box.

Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed with the
G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)

However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I am
keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it advances in
those areas.

> The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units on G5 chips
> are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering. So if one
> is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers seem only so
> so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor. This says
> nothing about OS X performance, of course.
>
> So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means minimal threading.

In these tests it would seem so.

>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source software
>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that specific choices
>
>
>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would be interesting

>
>
>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done anything to
>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited examples make
>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is optimized
>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not talking quad
>
>
>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
>
>
> Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the OS I can't imagine
> the situation is a lot better.

I dunno. We can speculate.

> So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says Pete Leoni has
> had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's benchmarking
> the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on that, and I chime
> in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely inefficient in some
> areas that are crucial for high performance computing (threading, kernel
> access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths" and demands
> for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that they just reflecty
> my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.

Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking commercial
operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I have no
problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.

> OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would guess is very
> appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware that is leaning
> into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the chalkboard in
> Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said, "Wow, what
> a great way to destroy my database queries!"

Linus is brilliant, of course.

> However, let's look at another
> explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware. The developer
> versions for Intel hardware seem distressingly fast in comparison to supposedly
> superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early G4 with OS 9 on
> it remembers installing OS X and thinking, "Well it sure is pretty but it
> sure is slower too." At the time it was attributed to the new GUI but now
> that there's more evidence out there maybe that should be re-thought. The
> user space and kernel space on *nix machines is usually quite distinct, so

> do you think maybe Apple made some kernel changes in Intel OS X? I don't
> have access to the software, so I can't say for sure if they've actually
> gone monolithic but from the benchmarks that would be a *highly* logical
> guess. If they haven't gone fully monolithic I would expect that they lifted
> some more code from a BSD licensed *nix to vastly improve the current kernel
> space. I'd still be on monolithic but it almost has to be one or the other.
>
>
> Or maybe I'm just peddling urban myths . . .

Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely it will
change for PPC. We'll see.

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

> TCB
>
>
>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very interesting
>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX, in
>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that combination does.
>>This is all a moving target.
>>
>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX is not open
>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with his
>>specific statistical software he finds better performance under Linux
>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this says much
>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use (other than his
>
>
>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe he should
>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine - although they

---

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Jamie K on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 16:53:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gt;>>>
>>>>
>>>>TCB wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>The G5 is a fine RISC chip. The core technology is also what's in most
>>>

>>>of
>>>
>>>
>>>>>the supercomputer gamer consoles as well. However, many people have been
>>>>>very surprised at the penalty in performance running OS X vs the couple
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>
>>>>>GNU\Linux flavors available for the chip. If the reports I hear are true
>>>>>there is a lot of, erm, "optimization" that could be done in OS X to
>
> make
>
>>>>>it snappier. Why they don't is beyond me, but the evidence is pretty
>
> hard
>
>>>>>to argue against.
>>>>>
>>>>>What's the state of memory/drive technology in OS X these days? That
>
> could
>
>>>>>have a lot to do with it as well.
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB
>>>>>
>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Morgan <morganp@ntplx.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Hi James,
>>>>>>>Our Buddy Pete Leoni figured this one out long
>>>>>>>ago - his 3 gig Celeron running OSX totally spanked
>>>>>>>a dual G5 in a HUGE way !!
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Morgan
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Hey Morgan! I think I smell some B.S. I'm having a hard time believing
>>>>>
>>>>>a
>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Celeron could beat a G5, maybe an early 1.6 single processor with the
>>>
>>>slower
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>bus speed???, but I doubt it. I don't think Virginia Tech would have
>>>
>>>built
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>the 4th fastest super computer on the planet with G5s if G5 were slow.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Why
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>don't you get the guy to post here. I think it would be interesting
>
> to
>
>>>>>hear
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>about his findings.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>James
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>James McCloskey wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>FYI, some interesting info about Mac OSX running on a PC.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> http://www.wired.com/news/mac/0,2125,68501,00.html?tw=wn_sto ry_related
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>http://osx86project.org/
>>>>>>>
>erlilo,

Look in the pockets of an old winter coat. Sometimes I get lucky and find

some money hiding there. Oh, by the way, it doesn't even have to be YOUR old winter coat! ;>)

Tony

"erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote in message news:43aba561$1@linux...
> ...and it comes with a 147$ coupong savings for earlier owners of a
> Presision UAD-plugin, to buy the rest of the Precision series... ...so,
> let me see, is there's some hided giftmoney in a secret pocket a place
> here on the little Christmas day today? Let me see, dollar one, dollar
> two, dollar three, dollar four, shit, I don't save any nickels at all, let
> me see, the eq cost 199 boxes, the new Multichannel comp. cost, what was
> it? 249$? Arghh, it will cost me about 300 boxes, so where's the saved
> $$$$ going???.... .... help me Santa Claus, do I really need this stuff
> with all the plugins I allready owns????.... ....let me see, dollar five,
> dollar six, dollar seven.....
> ....Merry Christmas to everyone!!!!....dollar eight, dollar nine, dollar
> ten, I must find some more secret pockets.....
>
> erlilo
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i melding
> news:43ab38e8@linux...
>> Just got off the phone with Tom Freemen over at UA. The new 4.1 software
>> should be up for DL in a couple of hours.
>>
>> This multiband slloks like it is going a bit beyond the usual crop of
>> multiband plugins and may actually be pretty useful. I sometimes use
>> multibands on bass but haven't really found any plugins ththat float my
>> boat
>> for use on the mix bus (if it's my mix, I'd rather re-mix than use a
>> multiband) but this might actually be a sueful tool for outside work tat
>> can't be remixed.
>>
>> I'm going to give the demo a twirl.
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>>
>>
>
>No Mac version??? Poopy! ;>)

Tony

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

news:43ab3cd5$1@linux...
> http://www.rayzoon.com/jamstix_feat.html
>
> This is absolutely the coolest thing since sliced bread. I've got it
> happening right now using BDF as the sound engine, but it also has a very
> good sounding sample set of it's own and or can be used with DFH as well.
> Mic Cross turned me on to this about a week ago and I have become obsessed
> with it.
>
> ;oP
>
>Hi people, and Happy Holidays to one and all...

Sort of OT -- I have a dual-boot set-up on my non-Paris computer, with
a 98SE partition just so I can run my older version of Wavelab
(3.1)... 2nd partition is XP for Cubase SX3.

I've had a problem with Wavelab "seeing" the cd drive -- it can read
from it no problem, but if I try to write I get an empty drop-down in
the "connected devices" box -- no joy.

Anyway, yesterday I was messing around, trying to load updated drivers
for that drive on the 98 partition -- and now I've managed to "lose"
that drive completely for that OS -- Device Manager doesn't list it
--it's gone... All is well on the XP partition...

Is this going need a re-load of 98? Would like to keep this thing
going, just to avoid spending the money to upgrade Wavelab to an
XP-friendly flavor (and don't want to pay for DVD and surround
features I have no use for)...

thanks in advance for any advice -- chasJamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>TCB wrote:
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>Looking at the links, Tiger 10.4.1 on a G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7 is shown to

>>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec is used. Holds its own (their

>>>example, LightWave - more examples would be appreciated but that's not

>>>their focus). I use LW so it's pertinent to me.
>>
>> That's not what I read. What I read is that OS X is disastrous at managing
>> mutliple threads. Most, but not all, workstation apps use relatively few
>> threads. Something like LW or AfterEffects will usually be only a few
threads
>> and the penalty for bad multi-threading will be minimal. Audio apps are

usually
>> more thread heavy than almost anything else that is "workstation" level
work,
>> so the consistently reported miserable performance with DP might make
some
>> sense.
>
>I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time. Its
>performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not "disastrous" in
>real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is overstated

>when it comes what I need in a studio box.
>
>Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed with the

>G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
>
>However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I am
>keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it advances in

>those areas.

OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend to arguing
that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the proof for which
you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient engine, you
telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing that it gets
you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want it to, which
has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.

>
>> The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units on G5 chips
>> are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering. So if one
>> is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers seem only
so
>> so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor. This says
>> nothing about OS X performance, of course.
>>
>> So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means minimal threading.
>
>In these tests it would seem so.
>
>
>>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source software
>>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that specific choices
>>
>>
>>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would be interesting
>>

>>
>>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done anything to
>>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited examples make

>>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is optimized

>>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not talking quad
>>
>>
>>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
>>
>>
>> Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the OS I can't
imagine
>> the situation is a lot better.
>
>I dunno. We can speculate.
>
>
>> So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says Pete Leoni has
>> had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's benchmarking
>> the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on that, and I
chime
>> in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely inefficient in some
>> areas that are crucial for high performance computing (threading, kernel
>> access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths" and demands
>> for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that they just reflecty
>> my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.
>
>Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking commercial

>operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I have no
>problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.

Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow Dog using
the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more than 40 threads
or so. OS X does that all on its own.

>
>> OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would guess is
very
>> appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware that is leaning
>> into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the chalkboard
in
>> Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said, "Wow, what
>> a great way to destroy my database queries!"
>
>Linus is brilliant, of course.

>
>
> > However, let's look at another
>> explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware. The developer
>> versions for Intel hardware seem distressingly fast in comparison to supposedly
>> superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early G4 with OS
9 on
>> it remembers installing OS X and thinkin

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Deej [1] on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 18:58:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

e choices he did for his application.
> >>>
> >>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software I use for
> >>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software development
>
> >>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux
> >>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead, step by
> >>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
> >>>
> >>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very capable
>
> >>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ box I use
>
> >>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks for
server
> >>
> >>
> >>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio, video and
>
> >>>graphics system-wide.
> >>>
> >>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting to happen.
> >>>
> >>>Cheers,
> >>> -Jamie
> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Remember, in addition to what
> >>>
> >>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network admin and
developer.
> >>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about this
urban

> >>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a) the G5 is
> >>
> >> a fabulous
> >>
> >>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made in
kernel
> >>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly
mult-threaded
> >>>>environments.
> >>>>
> >>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
> >>>>
> >>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel does
> and
> >>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower than
the
> >>
> >> same
> >>
> >>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
> >>>>
> >>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
> >>>>
> >>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and about the
> >>
> >> guy
> >>
> >>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the supermodel
> >>
> >> who
> >>
> >>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written on the
> hotel
> >>>>bathroom mirror . . .
> >>>>
> >>>>TCB
> >>>>
> >>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>Hey Thad,
> >>>>>
> >>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd be
curious
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
> >>>>>

> >>>>>Cheers,
> >>>>>-Jamie
> >>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>TCB wrote:
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time. Its
>>performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not "disastrous" in
>>real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is overstated
>
>>when it comes what I need in a studio box.
>>Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed with the
>>G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
>>
>>However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I am
>>keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it advances in
>>those areas.
>
>
> OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend to arguing
> that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the proof for which
> you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient engine, you
> telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing that it gets
> you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want it to, which
> has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.

Thanks for sharing the links, Thad. Your original post did sound to me
like potential urban legend and you didn't post any supporting links
until asked. Now that you have, thanks.

I read them and they very clearly criticized OSX 10.4.1 for specific
shortfalls as a multi-threading server, as well as for not being open
source. However one does give thumbs up to OSX/G5 for workstation apps,
especially when altivec is brought into the picture. Fair enough on the
criticism, looks like room to improve. Fair enough on the altivec thing
also, that's a nice punch for PPC and we'll have to see what happens
with that on Intel.

No offense intended when I report how the dual 2.5GHZ G5 system works
out for media production here. It's pertinent info since that's what
most of us do with computers on this forum, particularly audio apps. And
if the inference is that a multi-threading problem disqualifies the Mac
for media production, I think it's fair to report that the dual G5 with
OSX 10.4.3 is doing very well as a media production machine overall,
from my experience. Which is not to say there aren't a few pesky bugs in
some of the apps, nothing's perfect yet unfortunately. Updates are
frequent and almost automatic which is heartening.

I have, BTW, offered criticisms of Apple in this forum. On the flip side it doesn't seem that the threading issue you raise is by any means crippling the machine I use for the things it does around here. So in in that context, "disastrous" seems to be overstating the case.

As well, I am all for open source. I'm all for well integrated systems where all components and software are well matched and work well together (engine, wheels, controls, everything). And I dig strong media production software.

Linux is getting closer on the media front but is not there yet, as you've pointed out. Faster multi-threading seems like a good thing, and the media software continues to improve. At some point it will all be there on Linux. It seems inevitable, and that's great.

Right now it _is_ there on OSX...apparently despite any shortfalls in multithreading that may hold some applications back, such as heavy lifting server applications. You may want to investigate and appreciate the core media support built into OSX, pretty cool.

Nothing's perfect, Linux is cool and constantly improving, OSX is cool and also constantly improving, but not open source. So there it is.

OSX lets me get the work I need to do done now, the speed is excellent and the overall experience is decent. Linux lets the statistical guy get what he needs to do done now with faster (for his application) speed (assuming things haven't changed significantly since he tested) and he digs his overall experience. This is why choices are good.

> Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow Dog using
> the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more than 40 threads
> or so. OS X does that all on its own.

Cool. Yellow Dog makes the PPC look better in that circumstance. Looks like Apple has some work to do there, unless they chose their approach based on some other advantage that their designers perceive. It would be interesting to see what Apple's engineers would say about the issue.

>>Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely it will
>>change for PPC. We'll see.
>
> Why is that likely? Why would Apple tell all of their PPC users that they've
> been sucking up CPU cycles all of these years by using faulty kernel technology?
> Why would they spend time on the kernel space of an operating system they've
> already decided to drop in the end? Why not just talk about how "optimized"
> the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?

Typically when a new version of OSX comes out it gets more efficient.
Part is recompiling with the latest compiler. Part is optimizing. So it
would not be at all unusual for the next version to get faster.

PPC is not getting dropped for a while yet. New PPC PowerMacs may yet be
released before that line changes. It makes most sense for Apple to see
Intel appear in laptops as that's where PPC is weakest right now. And
maybe the low end boxes if there is a price advantage to building with
Intel there.

Of course making everyone buy new hardware (and software) is part of the
closed source game, and not just from Apple. Heck, even Linux is getting
to the point where ubergeeks are retiring those old 386 boxes. :^)

But since my PowerMac already does what I need it to do, it's
comfortably above my threshold of need. I can wait out the Intel
transition and see how it goes.

I'm not at all unhappy to see computers getting faster, especially
laptops, and at some point if I need more speed for OSX it appears that
I'll have the choice.

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

> TCB
>
>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very interesting
>
>
>>>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX, in
>>>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that combination does.
>
>

>>>>This is all a moving target.
>>>>
>>>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX is not open
>
>
>>>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with his
>>>>specific statistical software he finds better performance under Linux
>
>
>>>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this says much
>
>
>>>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use (other than his
>>>
>>>
>>>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe he should
>
>
>>>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine - although they
>>>
>>>
>>>>may not have been out when he wrote his review - the HD one rocks).
>>>>But I can see why he made the choices he did for his application.
>>>>
>>>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software I use for
>>>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software development
>
>
>>>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux
>>>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead, step by
>>>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
>>>>
>>>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very capable
>
>
>>>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ box I use
>
>
>>>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks for server
>>>
>>>
>>>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio, video and
>
>
>>>>graphics system-wide.
>>>>
>>>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting to happen.
>>>>

>>>>Cheers,
>>>>-Jamie
>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Remember, in addition to what
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network admin and developer.
>>>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about this urban
>>>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a) the G5 is
>>>
>>>a fabulous
>>>
>>>
>>>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made in kernel
>>&

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 19:23:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

much as I hate Apple. So then, about this urban
>>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a) the G5 is
>>
>> a fabulous
>>
>>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made in kernel
>>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly mult-threaded
>>>>environments.
>>>>
>>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
>>>>
>>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel does
and
>>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower than the
>>
>> same
>>
>>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
>>>>
>>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
>>>>
>>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and about the
>>
>> guy
>>

>>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the supermodel
>>
>> who
>>
>>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written on the
hotel
>>>>bathroom mirror . . .
>>>>
>>>>TCB
>>>>
>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Hey Thad,
>>>>>
>>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd be curious
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
>>>>>
>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.comIf Wavelab doesn't see the drive, then it means that Wavelab
doesn't
support that drive.

Make sure you have the latest CD drivers:

ftp://ftp.steinberg.net/Download/Hardware/CD_DVD_Recorder_Up dates/Pc/

David.

Chas. Duncan wrote:
> Hi people, and Happy Holidays to one and all...
>
> Sort of OT -- I have a dual-boot set-up on my non-Paris computer, with
> a 98SE partition just so I can run my older version of Wavelab
> (3.1)... 2nd partition is XP for Cubase SX3.
>
> I've had a problem with Wavelab "seeing" the cd drive -- it can read
> from it no problem, but if I try to write I get an empty drop-down in
> the "connected devices" box -- no joy.
>
> Anyway, yesterday I was messing around, trying to load updated drivers
> for that drive on the 98 partition -- and now I've managed to "lose"
> that drive completely for that OS -- Device Manager doesn't list it
> --it's gone... All is well on the XP partition...

>
> Is this going need a re-load of 98? Would like to keep this thing
> going, just to avoid spending the money to upgrade Wavelab to an
> XP-friendly flavor (and don't want to pay for DVD and surround
> features I have no use for)...
>
> thanks in advance for any advice -- chas
>He, he, Tony.
It is winter here now, so it was the wintercoats where I was trying to find
something, both old and the new one. Now where is my summer clothes?-o)

Erling

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> skrev i melding
news:43ac3714@linux...
> erlilo,
>
> Look in the pockets of an old winter coat. Sometimes I get lucky and find
> some money hiding there. Oh, by the way, it doesn't even have to be YOUR
> old winter coat! ;>)
>
> Tony
>
>
> "erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote in message news:43aba561$1@linux...
>> ...and it comes with a 147$ coupong savings for earlier owners of a
>> Presision UAD-plugin, to buy the rest of the Precision series... ...so,
>> let me see, is there's some hided giftmoney in a secret pocket a place
>> here on the little Christmas day today? Let me see, dollar one, dollar
>> two, dollar three, dollar four, shit, I don't save any nickels at all,
>> let me see, the eq cost 199 boxes, the new Multichannel comp. cost, what
>> was it? 249$? Arghh, it will cost me about 300 boxes, so where's the
>> saved $$$$ going???.... .... help me Santa Claus, do I really need this
>> stuff with all the plugins I allready owns????.... ....let me see, dollar
>> five, dollar six, dollar seven.....
>> ....Merry Christmas to everyone!!!!....dollar eight, dollar nine, dollar
>> ten, I must find some more secret pockets.....
>>
>> erlilo
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> skrev i melding
>> news:43ab38e8@linux...
>>> Just got off the phone with Tom Freemen over at UA. The new 4.1 software
>>> should be up for DL in a couple of hours.
>>>
>>> This multiband slloks like it is going a bit beyond the usual crop of
>>> multiband plugins and may actually be pretty useful. I sometimes use
>>> multibands on bass but haven't really found any plugins ththat float my

>>> boat
>>> for use on the mix bus (if it's my mix, I'd rather re-mix than use a
>>> multiband) but this might actually be a sueful tool for outside work tat
>>> can't be remixed.
>>>
>>> I'm going to give the demo a twirl.
>>>
>>> ;o)
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>If you go here you can update the CD/DVD recorder in Wavelab:
 http://www.steinberg.de/DocSupportDisplay_sbc88b.html?templ=
&doclink=/webvideo/Steinberg/support/doc/updates_applica
tions_pro_pc_en.html&Langue_ID=&Product_ID=

Have you tried to find the CD burner again in "Find new hardware" in the
Control Panel "?

Erling

"Chas. Duncan" <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> skrev i melding
news:mueoq1lgph2loia7qtui0qef54bn53m3r4@4ax.com...
> Hi people, and Happy Holidays to one and all...
>
> Sort of OT -- I have a dual-boot set-up on my non-Paris computer, with
> a 98SE partition just so I can run my older version of Wavelab
> (3.1)... 2nd partition is XP for Cubase SX3.
>
> I've had a problem with Wavelab "seeing" the cd drive -- it can read
> from it no problem, but if I try to write I get an empty drop-down in
> the "connected devices" box -- no joy.
>
> Anyway, yesterday I was messing around, trying to load updated drivers
> for that drive on the 98 partition -- and now I've managed to "lose"
> that drive completely for that OS -- Device Manager doesn't list it
> --it's gone... All is well on the XP partition...
>
> Is this going need a re-load of 98? Would like to keep this thing
> going, just to avoid spending the money to upgrade Wavelab to an
> XP-friendly flavor (and don't want to pay for DVD and surround
> features I have no use for)...
>
> thanks in advance for any advice -- chas
>>Why not just talk about how "optimized"

the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?

.....which is exactly the plan.

;o)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac40b4$1@linux...
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >
> >TCB wrote:
> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>Looking at the links, Tiger 10.4.1 on a G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7 is shown to
>
> >>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec is used. Holds its own (their
>
> >>>example, LightWave - more examples would be appreciated but that's not
>
> >>>their focus). I use LW so it's pertinent to me.
> >>
> >> That's not what I read. What I read is that OS X is disastrous at
managing
> >> mutliple threads. Most, but not all, workstation apps use relatively
few
> >> threads. Something like LW or AfterEffects will usually be only a few
> threads
> >> and the penalty for bad multi-threading will be minimal. Audio apps are
> usually
> >> more thread heavy than almost anything else that is "workstation" level
> work,
> >> so the consistently reported miserable performance with DP might make
> some
> >> sense.
> >
> >I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time. Its
> >performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not "disastrous" in
> >real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is overstated
>
> >when it comes what I need in a studio box.
> >
> >Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed with the
>
> >G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
> >
> >However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I am
> >keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it advances in
>

> >those areas.
>
> OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend to arguing
> that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the proof for
which
> you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient engine, you
> telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing that it
gets
> you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want it to, which
> has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.
>
> >
> >> The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units on G5
chips
> >> are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering. So if
one
> >> is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers seem only
> so
> >> so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor. This
says
> >> nothing about OS X performance, of course.
> >>
> >> So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means minimal
threading.
> >
> >In these tests it would seem so.
> >
> >
> >>>They give thu

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Jamie K on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 19:57:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gt;>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly mult-threaded
>>>>>environments.
>>>>>
>>>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
>>>>>
>>>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel does
>
> and
>
>>>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower than the
>>>
>>>same
>>>

>>>
>>>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
>>>>>
>>>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
>>>>>
>>>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and about the
>>>
>>>guy
>>>
>>>
>>>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the supermodel
>>>
>>>who
>>>
>>>
>>>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written on the
>
> hotel
>
>>>>>bathroom mirror . . .
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB
>>>>>
>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hey Thad,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd be curious
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>Why not just talk about how "optimized"
>the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
>
>.....which is exactly the plan.
>
>;o)

Apple's game is to sell you obsolescence so you will have to buy the next
box, but that is everybody's game not just apple. Job promised a G5 PowerBook

to be available a year ago July, IBM dropped the ball. IBM couldn't deliver
a cool enough G5 to put in a lap top, they were also supposed to deliver
a G5 3Ghz+ at the same time. IBM still has not been able to pull either
off as of yet. That is why Apple went to a quad processor to stay on top.
Apple had no good choice, but to exercise their option to go with Intel
chips. I for one welcome the idea of a cheaper, possibly faster, more upgradeable
Mac. However, I don't believe they will be all that much cheaper. My guess
is only 10-15% cheaper.

I hope they open it up to AMD also, but I doubt it. As for OSX running faster
on an Intel chip, I hope it does! I'd still like to see some fair and balanced
tests showing a 3Ghz Celeron running OSX, and being able to smoke a G5.

James

>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac40b4$1@linux...
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >TCB wrote:
>> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >>>Looking at the links, Tiger 10.4.1 on a G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7 is shown
to
>>
>> >>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec is used. Holds its own (their
>>
>> >>>example, LightWave - more examples would be appreciated but that's
not
>>
>> >>>their focus). I use LW so it's pertinent to me.
>> >>
>> >> That's not what I read. What I read is that OS X is disastrous at
>managing
>> >> mutliple threads. Most, but not all, workstation apps use relatively
>few
>> >> threads. Something like LW or AfterEffects will usually be only a few
>> threads
>> >> and the penalty for bad multi-threading will be minimal. Audio apps
are
>> usually
>> >> more thread heavy than almost anything else that is "workstation" level
>> work,
>> >> so the consistently reported miserable performance with DP might make
>> some

>> >> sense.
>> >
>> >I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time. Its
>> >performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not "disastrous" in
>> >real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is overstated
>>
>> >when it comes what I need in a studio box.
>> >
>> >Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed with the
>>
>> >G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
>> >
>> >However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I am
>> >keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it advances
in
>>
>> >those areas.
>>
>> OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend to arguing
>> that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the proof for
>which
>> you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient engine, you
>> telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing that it
>gets
>> you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want it to, which
>> has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.
>>
>> >
>> >> The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units on G5
>chips
>> >> are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering. So if
>one
>> >> is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers seem only
>> so
>> >> so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor. This
>says
>> >> nothing about OS X performance, of course.
>> >>
>> >> So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means minimal
>threading.
>> >
>> >In these tests it would seem so.
>> >
>> >
>> >>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source software
>> >>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that specific
>choices
>> >>

>> >>
>> >>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would be
>interesting
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done anything to
>> >>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited examples make
>>
>> >>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is optimized
>>
>> >>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not talking
quad
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the OS I can't
>> imagine
>> >> the situation is a lot better.
>> >
>> >I dunno. We can speculate.
>> >
>> >
>> >> So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says Pete Leoni
>has
>> >> had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's
>benchmarking
>> >> the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on that, and
I
>> chime
>> >> in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely inefficient in
>some
>> >> areas that are crucial for high performance computing (threading,
>kernel
>> >> access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths" and
>demands
>> >> for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that they just
>reflecty
>> >> my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.
>> >
>> >Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking commercial
>>
>> >operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I have no
>> >problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.
>>
>> Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow Dog using
>> the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more than 40

>threads
>> or so. OS X does that all on its own.
>>
>> >
>> >> OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would guess
is
>> very
>> >> appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware that is
>leaning
>> >> into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the chalkboard
>> in
>> >> Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said, "Wow,
>what
>> >> a great way to destroy my database queries!"
>> >
>> >Linus is brilliant, of course.
>> >
>> >
>> > > However, let's look at another
>> >> explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware. The
>developer
>> >> versions for Intel hardware seem distressingly fast in comparison to
>supposedly
>> >> superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early G4 with
OS
>> 9 on
>> >> it remembers installing OS X and thinking, "Well it sure is pretty
but
>> it
>> >> sure is slower too." At the time it was attributed to the new GUI but
>> now
>> >> that there's more evidence out there maybe that should be re-thought.
>> The
>> >> user space and kernel space on *nix machines is usually quite distinct,
>> so
>> >> do you think maybe Apple made some kernel changes in Intel OS X? I
>don't
>> >> have access to the software, so I can't say for sure if they've
>actually
>> >> gone monolithic but from the benchmarks that would be a *highly*
>logical
>> >> guess. If they haven't gone fully monolithic I would expect that they
>> lifted
>> >> some more code from a BSD licensed *nix to vastly improve the current
>> kernel
>> >> space. I'd still be on monolithic but it almost has to be one or the
>other.
>> >>

>> >>
>> >> Or maybe I'm just peddling urban myths . . .
>> >
>> >Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely it will
>> >change for PPC. We'll see.
>>
>> Why is that likely? Why would Apple tell all of the

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Deej [1] on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 21:39:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

e seem distressingly fast in comparison to
> >supposedly
> >> >> superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early G4 with
> OS
> >> 9 on
> >> >> it remembers installing OS X and thinking, "Well it sure is pretty
> but
> >> it
> >> >> sure is slower too." At the time it was attributed to the new GUI
but
> >> now
> >> >> that there's more evidence out there maybe that should be
re-thought.
> >> The
> >> >> user space and kernel space on *nix machines is usually quite
distinct,
> >> so
> >> >> do you think maybe Apple made some kernel changes in Intel OS X? I
> >don't
> >> >> have access to the software, so I can't say for sure if they've
> >actually
> >> >> gone monolithic but from the benchmarks that would be a *highly*
> >logical
> >> >> guess. If they haven't gone fully monolithic I would expect that
they
> >> lifted
> >> >> some more code from a BSD licensed *nix to vastly improve the
current
> >> kernel
> >> >> space. I'd still be on monolithic but it almost has to be one or the
> >other.
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> Or maybe I'm just peddling urban myths . . .
> >> >

> >> >Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely it will
> >> >change for PPC. We'll see.
> >>
> >> Why is that likely? Why would Apple tell all of their PPC users that
> >they've
> >> been sucking up CPU cycles all of these years by using faulty kernel
> >technology?
> >> Why would they spend time on the kernel space of an operating system
> >they've
> >> already decided to drop in the end? Why not just talk about how
> >"optimized"
> >> the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
> >>
> >> TCB
> >>
> >> >Cheers,
> >> > -Jamie
> >> > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >> TCB
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very
interesting
> >>
> >> >>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX, in
> >> >>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that combination
does.
> >>
> >> >>>This is all a moving target.
> >> >>>
> >> >>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX is not
open
> >>
> >> >>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with his
> >> >>>specific statistical software he finds better performance under
Linux
> >>
> >> >>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this says
much
> >>
> >> >>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use (other than
> >his
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe he
should

> >>
> >> >>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine - although
> they
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>> may not have been out when he wrote his review - the HD one rocks).
> >> >>>But I can see why he made the choices he did for his application.
> >> >>>
> >> >>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software I use for
> >> >>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software
development
> >>
> >> >>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux
> >> >>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead, step by
> >> >>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
> >> >>>
> >> >>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very
capable
> >>
> >> >>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ box I
use
> >>
> >> >>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks for
> >server
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio, video
and
> >>
> >> >>>graphics system-wide.
> >> >>>
> >> >>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting to
happen.
> >> >>>
> >> >>>Cheers,
> >> >>> -Jamie
> >> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >> >>>
> >> >>>
> >> >>>Remember, in addition to what
> >> >>>
> >> >>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network admin and
> >developer.
> >> >>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about this
> >urban
> >> >>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a) the G5
> is
> >> >>

> >> >> a fabulous
> >> >>
> >> >>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made in
> >kernel
> >> >>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly
> >mult-threaded
> >> >>>>environments.
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel
does
> >> and
> >> >>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower than
> >the
> >> >>
> >> >> same
> >> >>
> >> >>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and about
> the
> >> >>
> >> >> guy
> >> >>
> >> >>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the
supermodel
> >> >>
> >> >> who
> >> >>
> >> >>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written on
the
> >> hotel
> >> >>>>bathroom mirror . . .
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>TCB
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>>Hey Thad,
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd be
> >curious
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>

> >> >>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>>Cheers,
> >> >>>>>-Jamie
> >> >>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >>
> >
> >Erling -- thanks -- yes I tried the "new hardware" idea... Windows
didn't see it... Not sure what my next move is...

Also -- thanks for the Steinberg link -- that was the first thing I
tried though... Didn't work (or: I did something wrong -- always a
strong possibility). Anyway -- my problem now is the larger one that
I've managed to "lose" the cd drive entirely -- at least as far as my
98 partition is concerned...

Any other thoughts? thanks again -- Chas.

On Fri, 23 Dec 2005 19:51:50 +0100, "erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote:

>If you go here you can update the CD/DVD recorder in Wavelab:
> http://www.steinberg.de/DocSupportDisplay_sbc88b.html?templ=
&doclink=/webvideo/Steinberg/support/doc/updates_applica
tions_pro_pc_en.html&Langue_ID=&Product_ID=
>
>Have you tried to find the CD burner again in "Find new hardware" in the
>Control Panel "?
>
>Erling
>
>"Chas. Duncan" <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> skrev i melding
>news:mueoq1lgph2loia7qtui0qef54bn53m3r4@4ax.com...
>> Hi people, and Happy Holidays to one and all...
>>
>> Sort of OT -- I have a dual-boot set-up on my non-Paris computer, with
>> a 98SE partition just so I can run my older version of Wavelab
>> (3.1)... 2nd partition is XP for Cubase SX3.
>>
>> I've had a problem with Wavelab "seeing" the cd drive -- it can read
>> from it no problem, but if I try to write I get an empty drop-down in
>> the "connected devices" box -- no joy.
>>
>> Anyway, yesterday I was messing around, trying to load updated drivers
>> for that drive on the 98 partition -- and now I've managed to "lose"
>> that drive completely for that OS -- Device Manager doesn't list it
>> --it's gone... All is well on the XP partition...
>>
>> Is this going need a re-load of 98? Would like to keep this thing

>> going, just to avoid spending the money to upgrade Wavelab to an
>> XP-friendly flavor (and don't want to pay for DVD and surround
>> features I have no use for)...
>>
>> thanks in advance for any advice -- chas
>>
>Gee that does look interesting. And only $79?

So how does it jam with you? I assume it listens to you somehow. Does it
take sound inputs, or MIDI or what?

I really should download the demo... ;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>http://www.rayzoon.com/jamstix_feat.html
>
>This is absolutely the coolest thing since sliced bread. I've got it
>happening right now using BDF as the sound engine, but it also has a very
>good sounding sample set of it's own and or can be used with DFH as well.
>Mic Cross turned me on to this about a week ago and I have become obsessed
>with it.
>
>;oP
>
>Hey Deej,

Remember, for media production GNU\Linux is probably a non-starter. The 2D
graphic design is getting pretty good, basic video editing is also improving
notably, but all of the proprietary stuff that makes the audio world go 'round
(VST, ASIO, DX, Audio Units, etc.) is not there and won't be for a very long
time, if ever. But for the daily tasks that many computers do, web browsing,
emailing, writing, spreadsheets, and so on, GNU\Linux is not only there it's
BETTER than the proprietary options. OpenOffice.org is, in my opinion, a
notable improvement over any proprietary office suite out there. Evolution
is a superb email/contact/scheduling app that will sync nicely to Palm devices.
I work in an Outlook/Exchange centric office so I can't use it for work,
but all of the super hip Google Desktop "index my 2GB inbox for me so I can
do complex searches in two seconds" stuff has been in Evolution for years.
Then, on top of all of that "desktop" stuff, a basic Debian install will
also include PostgreSQL (enterprise class database), Apache (#1 web server
in the world), Perl/Python/PHP programming languages, an elegant and powerful
shell, enterprise class firewall/router tools, and about fifty thousand other
cool things that will allow you to take control over your computing world
in a way that you might never have before. You know those moments when you
think, "Crikey, I wish every time I booted the machine I didn't have to click

these same four boxes and start these same two apps." One quick shell script
and you'll never have to touch it again.

The downside is that nobody is OBLIGATED to help you with computer problems.
I'll personally volunteer to do whatever I can to help you out if you'll
give a swing, but leaving Big Brother (be he Jobs or Gates) means none of
His underlings work on official help lines. If you want to get your first
taste (like most drugs the first taste is free, but unlike most drugs so
are all of the subsequent tastes) check out http://www.knoppix.org/ and
http://www.ubuntulinux.org/download/
for some live CDs. Live CDs are great because you boot off the CD and can
take a look at what these distros are about. Knoppix is a great resource
even as an XP rescue CD and includes a very nicely implemented KDE desktop,
while Ubuntu is a great beginners distrobution that includes "Gnome done
right" and is very good about managing slightly funky video drivers. You
can try either without touching your base OS install to get an idea what
using GNU\Linux will be like. Both Knoppix and Ubuntu are Debian based, so
my knowledge will be fairly useful if you run into problems.

The final downside is that once you're really in control of your computer
you won't ever want to use a proprietary OS again, ever. It will infuriate
you that someone else thinks he/she can tell you how an application should
run. You have been warned . . .

TCB

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>I have been tempted for a while to start educating myself myself about
>Linux. i had sort of put that on the shelf and moved on ot other things.
>After reading Thad's posts, I'm once again interested and I just happen
to
>have about 90% of the components here to build another DAW. All I need is
a
>CDR, Floppy and PSU and I'm there.
>
>I may just jump into this.
>
>;o)
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:43ac68e1@linux...
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >>Why not just talk about how "optimized"
>> >the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
>> >
>> >.....which is exactly the plan.
>> >
>> >;o)

>>
>> Apple's game is to sell you obsolescence so you will have to buy the next
>> box, but that is everybody's game not just apple. Job promised a G5
>PowerBook
>> to be available a year ago July, IBM dropped the ball. IBM couldn't
>deliver
>> a cool enough G5 to put in a lap top, they were also supposed to deliver
>> a G5 3Ghz+ at the same time. IBM still has not been able to pull either
>> off as of yet. That is why Apple went to a quad processor to stay on
top.
>> Apple had no good choice, but to exercise their option to go with Intel
>> chips. I for one welcome the idea of a cheaper, possibly faster, more
>upgradeable
>> Mac. However, I don't believe they will be all that much cheaper. My
>guess
>> is only 10-15% cheaper.
>>
>> I hope they open it up to AMD also, but I doubt it. As for OSX running
>faster
>> on an Intel chip, I hope it does! I'd still like to see some fair and
>balanced
>> tests showing a 3Ghz Celeron running OSX, and being able to smoke a G5.
>>
>>
>> James
>>
>>
>> >
>> >
>> >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac40b4$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> >TCB wrote:
>> >> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >> >>>Looking at the links, Tiger 10.4.1 on a G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7 is shown
>> to
>> >>
>> >> >>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by excelav on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 22:15:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ir PPC users that
>they've
>> been sucking up CPU cycles all of these years by using faulty kernel

>technology?
>> Why would they spend time on the kernel space of an operating system
>they've
>> already decided to drop in the end? Why not just talk about how
>"optimized"
>> the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> >Cheers,
>> > -Jamie
>> > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >
>> >
>> >> TCB
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very interesting
>>
>> >>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX, in
>> >>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that combination does.
>>
>> >>>This is all a moving target.
>> >>>
>> >>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX is not open
>>
>> >>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with his
>> >>>specific statistical software he finds better performance under Linux
>>
>> >>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this says much
>>
>> >>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use (other than
>his
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe he should
>>
>> >>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine - although
they
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>> may not have been out when he wrote his review - the HD one rocks).
>> >>>But I can see why he made the choices he did for his application.
>> >>>
>> >>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software I use for
>> >>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software development
>>
>> >>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux

>> >>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead, step by
>> >>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
>> >>>
>> >>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very capable
>>
>> >>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ box I use
>>
>> >>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks for
>server
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio, video and
>>
>> >>>graphics system-wide.
>> >>>
>> >>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting to happen.
>> >>>
>> >>>Cheers,
>> >>> -Jamie
>> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>Remember, in addition to what
>> >>>
>> >>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network admin and
>developer.
>> >>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about this
>urban
>> >>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a) the G5
is
>> >>
>> >> a fabulous
>> >>
>> >>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made in
>kernel
>> >>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly
>mult-threaded
>> >>>>environments.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel does
>> and
>> >>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower than
>the
>> >>
>> >> same
>> >>

>> >>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and about
the
>> >>
>> >> guy
>> >>
>> >>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the supermodel
>> >>
>> >> who
>> >>
>> >>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written on the
>> hotel
>> >>>>bathroom mirror . . .
>> >>>>
>> >>>>TCB
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>Hey Thad,
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd be
>curious
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>Cheers,
>> >>>>>-Jamie
>> >>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>
>I have been tempted for a while to start educating myself myself about
Linux. i had sort of put that on the shelf and moved on ot other things.
After reading Thad's posts, I'm once again interested and I just happen to
have about 90% of the components here to build another DAW. All I need is a
CDR, Floppy and PSU and I'm there.

I may just jump into this.

;o)
"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:43ac68e1@linux...
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

> >>Why not just talk about how "optimized"
> >the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
> >
> >.....which is exactly the plan.
> >
> >;o)
>
> Apple's game is to sell you obsolescence so you will have to buy the next
> box, but that is everybody's game not just apple. Job promised a G5
PowerBook
> to be available a year ago July, IBM dropped the ball. IBM couldn't
deliver
> a cool enough G5 to put in a lap top, they were also supposed to deliver
> a G5 3Ghz+ at the same time. IBM still has not been able to pull either
> off as of yet. That is why Apple went to a quad processor to stay on top.
> Apple had no good choice, but to exercise their option to go with Intel
> chips. I for one welcome the idea of a cheaper, possibly faster, more
upgradeable
> Mac. However, I don't believe they will be all that much cheaper. My
guess
> is only 10-15% cheaper.
>
> I hope they open it up to AMD also, but I doubt it. As for OSX running
faster
> on an Intel chip, I hope it does! I'd still like to see some fair and
balanced
> tests showing a 3Ghz Celeron running OSX, and being able to smoke a G5.
>
>
> James
>
>
> >
> >
> >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac40b4$1@linux...
> >>
> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> >
> >> >TCB wrote:
> >> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> >>>Looking at the links, Tiger 10.4.1 on a G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7 is shown
> to
> >>
> >> >>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec is used. Holds its own
(their
> >>
> >> >>>example, LightWave - more examples would be appreciated but that's
> not

> >>
> >> >>>their focus). I use LW so it's pertinent to me.
> >> >>
> >> >> That's not what I read. What I read is that OS X is disastrous at
> >managing
> >> >> mutliple threads. Most, but not all, workstation apps use relatively
> >few
> >> >> threads. Something like LW or AfterEffects will usually be only a
few
> >> threads
> >> >> and the penalty for bad multi-threading will be minimal. Audio apps
> are
> >> usually
> >> >> more thread heavy than almost anything else that is "workstation"
level
> >> work,
> >> >> so the consistently reported miserable performance with DP might
make
> >> some
> >> >> sense.
> >> >
> >> >I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time. Its
> >> >performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not "disastrous" in
> >> >real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is
overstated
> >>
> >> >when it comes what I need in a studio box.
> >> >
> >> >Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed with
the
> >>
> >> >G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
> >> >
> >> >However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I am
> >> >keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it advances
> in
> >>
> >> >those areas.
> >>
> >> OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend to
arguing
> >> that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the proof for
> >which
> >> you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient engine,
you
> >> telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing that it
> >gets
> >> you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want it to,

which
> >> has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.
> >>
> >> >
> >> >> The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units on G5
> >chips
> >> >> are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering. So if
> >one
> >> >> is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers seem
only
> >> so
> >> >> so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor. This
> >says
> >> >> nothing about OS X performance, of course.
> >> >>
> >> >> So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means minimal
> >threading.
> >> >
> >> >In these tests it would seem so.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source software
> >> >>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that specific
> >choices
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would be
> >interesting
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done anything to
> >> >>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited examples
make
> >>
> >> >>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is
optimized
> >>
> >> >>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not talking
> quad
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the OS I
can't
> >> imagine
> >> >> the situation is a lot better.

> >> >
> >> >I dunno. We can speculate.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >> So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says Pete Leoni
> >has
> >> >> had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's
> >benchmarking
> >> >> the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on that, and
> I
> >> chime
> >> >> in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely inefficient in
> >some
> >> >> areas that are crucial for high performance computing (threading,
> >kernel
> >> >> access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths" and
> >demands
> >> >> for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that they just
> >reflecty
> >> >> my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.
> >> >
> >> >Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking
commercial
> >>
> >> >operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I have no
> >> >problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.
> >>
> >> Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow Dog
using
> >> the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more than 40
> >threads
> >> or so. OS X does that all on its own.
> >>
> >> >
> >> >> OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would guess
> is
> >> very
> >> >> appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware that is
> >leaning
> >> >> into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the
chalkboard
> >> in
> >> >> Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said, "Wow,
> >what
> >> >> a great way to destroy my database queries!"
> >> >
> >> >Linus is brilliant, of course.
> >> >

> >> >
> >> > > However, let's look at another
> >> >> explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware. The
> >developer
> >> >> versions for Intel hardwar

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Deej [1] on Fri, 23 Dec 2005 23:36:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

n
> >> >> >real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is
> >overstated
> >> >>
> >> >> >when it comes what I need in a studio box.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed with
> >the
> >> >>
> >> >> >G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
> >> >> >
> >> >> >However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I am
> >> >> >keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it
advances
> >> in
> >> >>
> >> >> >those areas.
> >> >>
> >> >> OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend to
> >arguing
> >> >> that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the proof
> for
> >> >which
> >> >> you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient engine,
> >you
> >> >> telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing that
> it
> >> >gets
> >> >> you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want it to,
> >which
> >> >> has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.
> >> >>
> >> >> >
> >> >> >> The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units on
> G5
> >> >chips
> >> >> >> are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering. So

> if
> >> >one
> >> >> >> is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers seem
> >only
> >> >> so
> >> >> >> so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor.
This
> >> >says
> >> >> >> nothing about OS X performance, of course.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means
minimal
> >> >threading.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >In these tests it would seem so.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> >>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source software
> >> >> >>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that specific
> >> >choices
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would be
> >> >interesting
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done anything
> to
> >> >> >>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited examples
> >make
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is
> >optimized
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not
talking
> >> quad
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the OS I
> >can't
> >> >> imagine
> >> >> >> the situation is a lot better.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >I dunno. We can speculate.

> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> >> So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says Pete
Leoni
> >> >has
> >> >> >> had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's
> >> >benchmarking
> >> >> >> the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on that,
> and
> >> I
> >> >> chime
> >> >> >> in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely inefficient
> in
> >> >some
> >> >> >> areas that are crucial for high performance computing (threading,
> >> >kernel
> >> >> >> access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths" and
> >> >demands
> >> >> >> for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that they
> just
> >> >reflecty
> >> >> >> my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking
> >commercial
> >> >>
> >> >> >operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I have
> no
> >> >> >problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.
> >> >>
> >> >> Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow Dog
> >using
> >> >> the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more than
> 40
> >> >threads
> >> >> or so. OS X does that all on its own.
> >> >>
> >> >> >
> >> >> >> OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would
guess
> >> is
> >> >> very
> >> >> >> appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware that
> is
> >> >leaning
> >> >> >> into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the
> >chalkboard
> >> >> in

> >> >> >> Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said,
"Wow,
> >> >what
> >> >> >> a great way to destroy my database queries!"
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Linus is brilliant, of course.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> > > However, let's look at another
> >> >> >> explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware. The
> >> >developer
> >> >> >> versions for Intel hardware seem distressingly fast in comparison
> to
> >> >supposedly
> >> >> >> superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early G4
with
> >> OS
> >> >> 9 on
> >> >> >> it remembers installing OS X and thinking, "Well it sure is
pretty
> >> but
> >> >> it
> >> >> >> sure is slower too." At the time it was attributed to the new GUI
> >but
> >> >> now
> >> >> >> that there's more evidence out there maybe that should be
> >re-thought.
> >> >> The
> >> >> >> user space and kernel space on *nix machines is usually quite
> >distinct,
> >> >> so
> >> >> >> do you think maybe Apple made some kernel changes in Intel OS X?
> I
> >> >don't
> >> >> >> have access to the software, so I can't say for sure if they've
> >> >actually
> >> >> >> gone monolithic but from the benchmarks that would be a *highly*
> >> >logical
> >> >> >> guess. If they haven't gone fully monolithic I would expect that
> >they
> >> >> lifted
> >> >> >> some more code from a BSD licensed *nix to vastly improve the
> >current
> >> >> kernel
> >> >> >> space. I'd still be on monolithic but it almost has to be one or
> the
> >> >other.
> >> >> >>

> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> Or maybe I'm just peddling urban myths . . .
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely it will
> >> >> >change for PPC. We'll see.
> >> >>
> >> >> Why is that likely? Why would Apple tell all of their PPC users that
> >> >they've
> >> >> been sucking up CPU cycles all of these years by using faulty kernel
> >> >technology?
> >> >> Why would they spend time on the kernel space of an operating system
> >> >they've
> >> >> already decided to drop in the end? Why not just talk about how
> >> >"optimized"
> >> >> the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
> >> >>
> >> >> TCB
> >> >>
> >> >> >Cheers,
> >> >> > -Jamie
> >> >> > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> >> TCB
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very
> >interesting
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX, in
> >> >> >>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that combination
> >does.
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>This is all a moving target.
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX is not
> >open
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with his
> >> >> >>>specific statistical software he finds better performance under
> >Linux
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this says
> >much
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use (other
> than
> >> >his

> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe he
> >should
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine -
although
> >> they
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>> may not have been out when he wrote his review - the HD one
rocks).
> >> >> >>>But I can see why he made the choices he did for his application.
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software I use
> for
> >> >> >>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software
> >development
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux
> >> >> >>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead, step
> by
> >> >> >>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very
> >capable
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ box
> I
> >use
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks for
> >> >server
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio, video
> >and
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>graphics system-wide.
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting to
> >happen.
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>>Cheers,
> >> >> >>> -Jamie
> >> >> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>>

> >> >> >>>Remember, in addition to what
> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network admin
> and
> >> >developer.
> >> >> >>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about
this
> >> >urban
> >> >> >>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a) the
> G5
> >> is
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> a fabulous
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made
> in
> >> >kernel
> >> >> >>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly
> >> >mult-threaded
> >> >> >>>>environments.
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel
> >does
> >> >> and
> >> >> >>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower
> than
> >> >the
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> same
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and
about
> >> the
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> guy
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the
> >supermodel
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> who
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written on

> >the
> >> >> hotel
> >> >> >>>>bathroom mirror . . .
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>TCB
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>>Hey Thad,
> >> >> >>>>>
> >> >> >>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd be
> >> >curious
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
> >> >> >>>>>
> >> >> >>>>>Cheers,
> >> >> >>>>>-Jamie
> >> >> >>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >
> >
>Tony,

Take care on your trip and have a good one.

Deej

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
news:43ac8956@linux...
> Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this
weekend
> and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night. If
> not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not the PC
> thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it in the
> spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're offended,
> then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in your travels,
show
> respect, and cherish the people you love.
>
> Peace,
>
> Tony
>
>I'm doing basic recording on a fresh install and when I close Paris I'm

getting blue screen hard crash with assertion errors. Is it ok to use
an EDS mono delay on two adjacent channels while using stereo native
effects? I would expect this to be ok and not the problem but having a
totally fresh install with only a couple plugs it really frustrating. I
even started with a new project not based on Default Project.ppj so I
know it's not a corrupt project. Any help appreciated.

Thanks,
JohnA female musican who knows about Ubuntu? Uh, is she single?

;-)

TCB

>> You have been warned . . .
>>
>
>I'll take that as an encouragement ;o). It may be a couple of weeks before
I
>can come up for air, but I've always wanted to get into this stuff. Also,
>it's interesting about Ubuntu. I have a studio client whose nomme de guerre
>is Ubuntu. She is very savvy and actually, now that I think of it the
>project she left here last year on a bunch of CD's was tracked up in your
>neighborhood on a DP system and she wanted to do some dubs here then remix
>the whole project. Then Bush was reelected and she totally wigged and moved
>to Kauai. I think she's into Linux'esque stuff quite a bit. Her dad is my
>dentist here and told me the other day that she's coming back to town (today
>or tomorrow) and wants to do some more work in the studio. I sold her my
>Ensoniq MR76 before she split and she had it shipped over to the islands
so
>she's likely to have a bunch of midi songs to import into my MR Rack. I'll
>see if she will give me some Linux pointers between Christmas and the middle
>of January.
>
>Cheers,
>
>Deej
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac8714$1@linux...
>>
>> Hey Deej,
>>
>> Remember, for media production GNU\Linux is probably a non-starter. The
2D
>> graphic design is getting pretty good, basic video editing is also
>improving
>> notably, but all of the proprietary stuff that makes the audio world go
>'round

>> (VST, ASIO, DX, Audio Units, etc.) is not there and won't be for a very
>long
>> time, if ever. But for the daily tasks that many computers do, web
>browsing,
>> emailing, writing, spreadsheets, and so on, GNU\Linux is not only there
>it's
>> BETTER than the proprietary options. OpenOffice.org is, in my opinion,
a
>> notable improvement over any proprietary office suite out there. Evolution
>> is a superb email/contact/scheduling app that will sync nicely to Palm
>devices.
>> I work in an Outlook/Exchange centric office so I can't use it for work,
>> but all of the super hip Google Desktop "index my 2GB inbox for me so
I
>can
>> do complex searches in two seconds" stuff has been in Evolution for years.
>> Then, on top of all of that "desktop" stuff, a basic Debian install will
>> also include PostgreSQL (enterprise class database), Apache (#1 web server
>> in the world), Perl/Python/PHP programming languages, an elegant and
>powerful
>> shell, enterprise class firewall/router tools, and about fifty thousand
>other
>> cool things that will allow you to take control over your computing world
>> in a way that you might never have before. You know those moments when
you
>> think, "Crikey, I wish every time I booted the machine I didn't have to
>click
>> these same four boxes and start these same two apps." One quick shell
>script
>> and you'll never have to touch it again.
>>
>> The downside is that nobody is OBLIGATED to help you with computer
>problems.
>> I'll personally volunteer to do whatever I can to help you out if you'll
>> give a swing, but leaving Big Brother (be he Jobs or Gates) means none
of
>> His underlings work on official help lines. If you want to get your first
>> taste (like most drugs the first taste is free, but unlike most drugs
so
>> are all of the subsequent tastes) check out http://www.knoppix.org/ and
>http://www.ubuntulinux.org/download/
>> for some live CDs. Live CDs are great because you boot off the CD and
can
>> take a look at what these distros are about. Knoppix is a great resource
>> even as an XP rescue CD and includes a very nicely implemented KDE
>desktop,
>> while Ubuntu is a great beginners distrobution that includes "Gnome done
>> right" and is very good about managing slightly funky video drivers. You

>> can try either without touching your base OS install to get an idea what
>> using GNU\Linux will be like. Both Knoppix and Ubuntu are Debian based,
so
>> my knowledge will be fairly useful if you run into problems.
>>
>> The final downside is that once you're really in control of your computer
>> you won't ever want to use a proprietary OS again, ever. It will infuriate
>> you that someone else thinks he/she can tell you how an application should
>> run. You have been warned . . .
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >I have been tempted for a while to start educating myself myself about
>> >Linux. i had sort of put that on the shelf and moved on ot other things.
>> >After reading Thad's posts, I'm once again interested and I just happen
>> to
>> >have about 90% of the components here to build another DAW. All I need
is
>> a
>> >CDR, Floppy and PSU and I'm there.
>> >
>> >I may just jump into this.
>> >
>> >;o)
>> >"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> >news:43ac68e1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >> >>Why not just talk about how "optimized"
>> >> >the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
>> >> >
>> >> >.....which is exactly the plan.
>> >> >
>> >> >;o)
>> >>
>> >> Apple's game is to sell you obsolescence so you will have to buy the
>next
>> >> box, but that is everybody's game not just apple. Job promised a G5
>> >PowerBook
>> >> to be available a year ago July, IBM dropped the ball. IBM couldn't
>> >deliver
>> >> a cool enough G5 to put in a lap top, they were also supposed to
>deliver
>> >> a G5 3Ghz+ at the same time. IBM still has not been able to pull
>either
>> >> off as of yet. That is why Apple went to a quad processor to stay
on

>> top.
>> >> Apple had no good choice, but to exercise their option to go with
>Intel
>> >> chips. I for one welcome the idea of a cheaper, possibly faster, more
>> >upgradeable
>> >> Mac. However, I don't believe they will be all that much cheaper.
  My
>> >guess
>> >> is only 10-15% cheaper.
>> >>
>> >> I hope they open it up to AMD also, but I doubt it. As for OSX running
>> >faster
>> >> on an Intel chip, I hope it does! I'd still like to see some fair
and
>> >balanced
>> >> tests showing a 3Ghz Celeron running OSX, and being able to smoke a
G5.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> James
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac40b4$1@linux...
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Jamie K <

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 00:24:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gt;
>> >> >
>> >> >>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source software
>> >> >>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that specific
>> >choices
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would be
>> >interesting
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done anything
to
>> >> >>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited examples
>make

>> >>
>> >> >>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is
>optimized
>> >>
>> >> >>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not talking
>> quad
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the OS I
>can't
>> >> imagine
>> >> >> the situation is a lot better.
>> >> >
>> >> >I dunno. We can speculate.
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >> So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says Pete Leoni
>> >has
>> >> >> had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's
>> >benchmarking
>> >> >> the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on that,
and
>> I
>> >> chime
>> >> >> in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely inefficient
in
>> >some
>> >> >> areas that are crucial for high performance computing (threading,
>> >kernel
>> >> >> access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths" and
>> >demands
>> >> >> for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that they
just
>> >reflecty
>> >> >> my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.
>> >> >
>> >> >Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking
>commercial
>> >>
>> >> >operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I have
no
>> >> >problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.
>> >>
>> >> Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow Dog
>using

>> >> the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more than
40
>> >threads
>> >> or so. OS X does that all on its own.
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> >> OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would guess
>> is
>> >> very
>> >> >> appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware that
is
>> >leaning
>> >> >> into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the
>chalkboard
>> >> in
>> >> >> Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said, "Wow,
>> >what
>> >> >> a great way to destroy my database queries!"
>> >> >
>> >> >Linus is brilliant, of course.
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > > However, let's look at another
>> >> >> explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware. The
>> >developer
>> >> >> versions for Intel hardware seem distressingly fast in comparison
to
>> >supposedly
>> >> >> superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early G4 with
>> OS
>> >> 9 on
>> >> >> it remembers installing OS X and thinking, "Well it sure is pretty
>> but
>> >> it
>> >> >> sure is slower too." At the time it was attributed to the new GUI
>but
>> >> now
>> >> >> that there's more evidence out there maybe that should be
>re-thought.
>> >> The
>> >> >> user space and kernel space on *nix machines is usually quite
>distinct,
>> >> so
>> >> >> do you think maybe Apple made some kernel changes in Intel OS X?
I
>> >don't
>> >> >> have access to the software, so I can't say for sure if they've
>> >actually

>> >> >> gone monolithic but from the benchmarks that would be a *highly*
>> >logical
>> >> >> guess. If they haven't gone fully monolithic I would expect that
>they
>> >> lifted
>> >> >> some more code from a BSD licensed *nix to vastly improve the
>current
>> >> kernel
>> >> >> space. I'd still be on monolithic but it almost has to be one or
the
>> >other.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Or maybe I'm just peddling urban myths . . .
>> >> >
>> >> >Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely it will
>> >> >change for PPC. We'll see.
>> >>
>> >> Why is that likely? Why would Apple tell all of their PPC users that
>> >they've
>> >> been sucking up CPU cycles all of these years by using faulty kernel
>> >technology?
>> >> Why would they spend time on the kernel space of an operating system
>> >they've
>> >> already decided to drop in the end? Why not just talk about how
>> >"optimized"
>> >> the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
>> >>
>> >> TCB
>> >>
>> >> >Cheers,
>> >> > -Jamie
>> >> > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >> TCB
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very
>interesting
>> >>
>> >> >>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX, in
>> >> >>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that combination
>does.
>> >>
>> >> >>>This is all a moving target.
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX is not

>open
>> >>
>> >> >>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with his
>> >> >>>specific statistical software he finds better performance under
>Linux
>> >>
>> >> >>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this says
>much
>> >>
>> >> >>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use (other
than
>> >his
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe he
>should
>> >>
>> >> >>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine - although
>> they
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>> may not have been out when he wrote his review - the HD one rocks).
>> >> >>>But I can see why he made the choices he did for his application.
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software I use
for
>> >> >>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software
>development
>> >>
>> >> >>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux
>> >> >>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead, step
by
>> >> >>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very
>capable
>> >>
>> >> >>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ box
I
>use
>> >>
>> >> >>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks for
>> >server
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio, video
>and
>> >>

>> >> >>>graphics system-wide.
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting to
>happen.
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>Cheers,
>> >> >>> -Jamie
>> >> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>Remember, in addition to what
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network admin
and
>> >developer.
>> >> >>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about this
>> >urban
>> >> >>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a) the
G5
>> is
>> >> >>
>> >> >> a fabulous
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made
in
>> >kernel
>> >> >>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly
>> >mult-threaded
>> >> >>>>environments.
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel
>does
>> >> and
>> >> >>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower
than
>> >the
>> >> >>
>> >> >> same
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and about
>> the
>> >> >>

>> >> >> guy
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the
>supermodel
>> >> >>
>> >> >> who
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written on
>the
>> >> hotel
>> >> >>>>bathroom mirror . . .
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>TCB
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>>Hey Thad,
>> >> >>>>>
>> >> >>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd be
>> >curious
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>
>> >> >>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
>> >> >>>>>
>> >> >>>>>Cheers,
>> >> >>>>>-Jamie
>> >> >>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>
>Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this weekend
and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night. If
not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not the PC
thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it in the
spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're offended,
then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in your travels, show
respect, and cherish the people you love.

Peace,

TonyIt will infuriate
> you that someone else thinks he/she can tell you how an application should
> run.

It already does.

> You have been warned . . .
>

I'll take that as an encouragement ;o). It may be a couple of weeks before I can come up for air, but I've always wanted to get into this stuff. Also, it's interesting about Ubuntu. I have a studio client whose nomme de guerre is Ubuntu. She is very savvy and actually, now that I think of it the project she left here last year on a bunch of CD's was tracked up in your neighborhood on a DP system and she wanted to do some dubs here then remix the whole project. Then Bush was reelected and she totally wigged and moved to Kauai. I think she's into Linux'esque stuff quite a bit. Her dad is my dentist here and told me the other day that she's coming back to town (today or tomorrow) and wants to do some more work in the studio. I sold her my Ensoniq MR76 before she split and she had it shipped over to the islands so she's likely to have a bunch of midi songs to import into my MR Rack. I'll see if she will give me some Linux pointers between Christmas and the middle of January.

Cheers,

Deej

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac8714$1@linux...
>
> Hey Deej,
>
> Remember, for media production GNU\Linux is probably a non-starter. The 2D
> graphic design is getting pretty good, basic video editing is also
improving
> notably, but all of the proprietary stuff that makes the audio world go
'round
> (VST, ASIO, DX, Audio Units, etc.) is not there and won't be for a very
long
> time, if ever. But for the daily tasks that many computers do, web
browsing,
> emailing, writing, spreadsheets, and so on, GNU\Linux is not only there
it's
> BETTER than the proprietary options. OpenOffice.org is, in my opinion, a
> notable improvement over any proprietary office suite out there. Evolution
> is a superb email/contact/scheduling app that will sync nicely to Palm
devices.
> I work in an Outlook/Exchange centric office so I can't use it for work,
> but all of the super hip Google Desktop "index my 2GB inbox for me so I
can
> do complex searches in two seconds" stuff has been in Evolution for years.
> Then, on top of all of that "desktop" stuff, a basic Debian install will
> also include PostgreSQL (enterprise class database), Apache (#1 web server
> in the world), Perl/Python/PHP programming languages, an elegant and

powerful
> shell, enterprise class firewall/router tools, and about fifty thousand
other
> cool things that will allow you to take control over your computing world
> in a way that you might never have before. You know those moments when you
> think, "Crikey, I wish every time I booted the machine I didn't have to
click
> these same four boxes and start these same two apps." One quick shell
script
> and you'll never have to touch it again.
>
> The downside is that nobody is OBLIGATED to help you with computer
problems.
> I'll personally volunteer to do whatever I can to help you out if you'll
> give a swing, but leaving Big Brother (be he Jobs or Gates) means none of
> His underlings work on official help lines. If you want to get your first
> taste (like most drugs the first taste is free, but unlike most drugs so
> are all of the subsequent tastes) check out http://www.knoppix.org/ and
http://www.ubuntulinux.org/download/
> for some live CDs. Live CDs are great because you boot off the CD and can
> take a look at what these distros are about. Knoppix is a great resource
> even as an XP rescue CD and includes a very nicely implemented KDE
desktop,
> while Ubuntu is a great beginners distrobution that includes "Gnome done
> right" and is very good about managing slightly funky video drivers. You
> can try either without touching your base OS install to get an idea what
> using GNU\Linux will be like. Both Knoppix and Ubuntu are Debian based, so
> my knowledge will be fairly useful if you run into problems.
>
> The final downside is that once you're really in control of your computer
> you won't ever want to use a proprietary OS again, ever. It will infuriate
> you that someone else thinks he/she can tell you how an application should
> run. You have been warned . . .
>
> TCB
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> >I have been tempted for a while to start educating myself myself about
> >Linux. i had sort of put that on the shelf and moved on ot other things.
> >After reading Thad's posts, I'm once again interested and I just happen
> to
> >have about 90% of the components here to build another DAW. All I need is
> a
> >CDR, Floppy and PSU and I'm there.
> >
> >I may just jump into this.
> >
> >;o)

> >"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >news:43ac68e1@linux...
> >>
> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> >> >>Why not just talk about how "optimized"
> >> >the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
> >> >
> >> >.....which is exactly the plan.
> >> >
> >> >;o)
> >>
> >> Apple's game is to sell you obsolescence so you will have to buy the
next
> >> box, but that is everybody's game not just apple. Job promised a G5
> >PowerBook
> >> to be available a year ago July, IBM dropped the ball. IBM couldn't
> >deliver
> >> a cool enough G5 to put in a lap top, they were also supposed to
deliver
> >> a G5 3Ghz+ at the same time. IBM still has not been able to pull
either
> >> off as of yet. That is why Apple went to a quad processor to stay on
> top.
> >> Apple had no good choice, but to exercise their option to go with
Intel
> >> chips. I for one welcome the idea of a cheaper, possibly faster, more
> >upgradeable
> >> Mac. However, I don't believe they will be all that much cheaper. My
> >guess
> >> is only 10-15% cheaper.
> >>
> >> I hope they open it up to AMD also, but I doubt it. As for OSX running
> >faster
> >> on an Intel chip, I hope it does! I'd still like to see some fair and
> >balanced
> >> tests showing a 3Ghz Celeron running OSX, and being able to smoke a G5.
> >>
> >>
> >> James
> >>
> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac40b4$1@linux...
> >> >>
> >> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> >> >
> >> >> >TCB wrote:

> >> >> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> >> >>>Looking at the links, Tiger 10.4.1 on a G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7 is
shown
> >> to
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec is used. Holds its own
> >(their
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>example, LightWave - more examples would be appreciated but
that's
> >> not
> >> >>
> >> >> >>>their focus). I use LW so it's pertinent to me.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> That's not what I read. What I read is that OS X is disastrous at
> >> >managing
> >> >> >> mutliple threads. Most, but not all, workstation apps use
relatively
> >> >few
> >> >> >> threads. Something like LW or AfterEffects will usually be only
> a
> >few
> >> >> threads
> >> >> >> and the penalty for bad multi-threading will be minimal. Audio
apps
> >> are
> >> >> usually
> >> >> >> more thread heavy than alm

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 00:57:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Audio
>apps
>> >> are
>> >> >> usually
>> >> >> >> more thread heavy than almost anything else that is "workstation"
>> >level
>> >> >> work,
>> >> >> >> so the consistently reported miserable performance with DP might
>> >make
>> >> >> some
>> >> >> >> sense.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time. Its
>> >> >> >performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not "disastrous"

>> in
>> >> >> >real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is
>> >overstated
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >when it comes what I need in a studio box.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed
with
>> >the
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I
am
>> >> >> >keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it
>advances
>> >> in
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >those areas.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend
to
>> >arguing
>> >> >> that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the proof
>> for
>> >> >which
>> >> >> you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient engine,
>> >you
>> >> >> telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing
that
>> it
>> >> >gets
>> >> >> you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want it
to,
>> >which
>> >> >> has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units
on
>> G5
>> >> >chips
>> >> >> >> are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering.
So
>> if
>> >> >one
>> >> >> >> is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers seem
>> >only

>> >> >> so
>> >> >> >> so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor.
>This
>> >> >says
>> >> >> >> nothing about OS X performance, of course.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means
>minimal
>> >> >threading.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >In these tests it would seem so.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source software
>> >> >> >>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that specific
>> >> >choices
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would be
>> >> >interesting
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done anything
>> to
>> >> >> >>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited examples
>> >make
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is
>> >optimized
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not
>talking
>> >> quad
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the OS
I
>> >can't
>> >> >> imagine
>> >> >> >> the situation is a lot better.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >I dunno. We can speculate.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says Pete

>Leoni
>> >> >has
>> >> >> >> had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's
>> >> >benchmarking
>> >> >> >> the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on that,
>> and
>> >> I
>> >> >> chime
>> >> >> >> in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely inefficient
>> in
>> >> >some
>> >> >> >> areas that are crucial for high performance computing (threading,
>> >> >kernel
>> >> >> >> access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths"
and
>> >> >demands
>> >> >> >> for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that they
>> just
>> >> >reflecty
>> >> >> >> my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking
>> >commercial
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I have
>> no
>> >> >> >problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow
Dog
>> >using
>> >> >> the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more than
>> 40
>> >> >threads
>> >> >> or so. OS X does that all on its own.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would
>guess
>> >> is
>> >> >> very
>> >> >> >> appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware
that
>> is
>> >> >leaning
>> >> >> >> into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the
>> >chalkboard
>> >> >> in

>> >> >> >> Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said,
>"Wow,
>> >> >what
>> >> >> >> a great way to destroy my database queries!"
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >Linus is brilliant, of course.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > > However, let's look at another
>> >> >> >> explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware.
The
>> >> >developer
>> >> >> >> versions for Intel hardware seem distressingly fast in comparison
>> to
>> >> >supposedly
>> >> >> >> superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early G4
>with
>> >> OS
>> >> >> 9 on
>> >> >> >> it remembers installing OS X and thinking, "Well it sure is
>pretty
>> >> but
>> >> >> it
>> >> >> >> sure is slower too." At the time it was attributed to the new
GUI
>> >but
>> >> >> now
>> >> >> >> that there's more evidence out there maybe that should be
>> >re-thought.
>> >> >> The
>> >> >> >> user space and kernel space on *nix machines is usually quite
>> >distinct,
>> >> >> so
>> >> >> >> do you think maybe Apple made some kernel changes in Intel OS
X?
>> I
>> >> >don't
>> >> >> >> have access to the software, so I can't say for sure if they've
>> >> >actually
>> >> >> >> gone monolithic but from the benchmarks that would be a *highly*
>> >> >logical
>> >> >> >> guess. If they haven't gone fully monolithic I would expect that
>> >they
>> >> >> lifted
>> >> >> >> some more code from a BSD licensed *nix to vastly improve the
>> >current
>> >> >> kernel
>> >> >> >> space. I'd still be on monolithic but it almost has to be one

or
>> the
>> >> >other.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> Or maybe I'm just peddling urban myths . . .
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely it
will
>> >> >> >change for PPC. We'll see.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Why is that likely? Why would Apple tell all of their PPC users
that
>> >> >they've
>> >> >> been sucking up CPU cycles all of these years by using faulty kernel
>> >> >technology?
>> >> >> Why would they spend time on the kernel space of an operating system
>> >> >they've
>> >> >> already decided to drop in the end? Why not just talk about how
>> >> >"optimized"
>> >> >> the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> TCB
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Cheers,
>> >> >> > -Jamie
>> >> >> > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> TCB
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very
>> >interesting
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX,
in
>> >> >> >>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that combination
>> >does.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>This is all a moving target.
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX is
not
>> >open
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with
his

>> >> >> >>>specific statistical software he finds better performance under
>> >Linux
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this
says
>> >much
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use (other
>> than
>> >> >his
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe
he
>> >should
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine -
>although
>> >> they
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>> may not have been out when he wrote his review - the HD one
>rocks).
>> >> >> >>>But I can see why he made the choices he did for his application.
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software I use
>> for
>> >> >> >>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software
>> >development
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux
>> >> >> >>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead,
step
>> by
>> >> >> >>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very
>> >capable
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ box
>> I
>> >use
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks
for
>> >> >server
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>

>> >> >> >>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio, video
>> >and
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>graphics system-wide.
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting to
>> >happen.
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>>Cheers,
>> >> >> >>> -Jamie
>> >> >> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>>Remember, in addition to what
>> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network admin
>> and
>> >> >developer.
>> >> >> >>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about
>this
>> >> >urban
>> >> >> >>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a)
the
>> G5
>> >> is
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> a fabulous
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made
>> in
>> >> >kernel
>> >> >> >>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly
>> >> >mult-threaded
>> >> >> >>>>environments.
>> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
>> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel
>> >does
>> >> >> and
>> >> >> >>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower
>> than
>> >> >the
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> same
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
>> >> >> >>>>

>> >> >> >>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
>> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and
>about
>> >> the
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> guy
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the
>> >supermodel
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> who
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written
on
>> >the
>> >> >> hotel
>> >> >> >>>>bathroom mirror . . .
>> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >>>>TCB
>> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >>>>>Hey Thad,
>> >> >> >>>>>
>> >> >> >>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd
be
>> >> >curious
>> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
>> >> >> >>>>>
>> >> >> >>>>>Cheers,
>> >> >> >>>>>-Jamie
>> >> >> >>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >> >>
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>It's generally a no no to have mono eds inserts going if you you have stereo
native inserts going. That very well could be your problem.
Rod
John <no@no.com> wrote:
>I'm doing basic recording on a fresh install and when I close Paris I'm

>getting blue screen hard crash with assertion errors. Is it ok to use
>an EDS mono delay on two adjacent channels while using stereo native
>effects? I would expect this to be ok and not the problem but having a

>totally fresh install with only a couple plugs it really frustrating. I

>even started with a new project not based on Default Project.ppj so I
>know it's not a corrupt project. Any help appreciated.
>
>Thanks,
>JohnYou go Deej! Looking forward to hearing about your Linux adventures.
There is some Linux audio software out there, be interested in your take
on it.

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

DJ wrote:
> It will infuriate
>
>>you that someone else thinks he/she can tell you how an application should
>>run.
>
>
> It already does.
>
>
>>You have been warned . . .
>>
>
>
> I'll take that as an encouragement ;o). It may be a couple of weeks before I
> can come up for air, but I've always wanted to get into this stuff. Also,
> it's interesting about Ubuntu. I have a studio client whose nomme de guerre
> is Ubuntu. She is very savvy and actually, now that I think of it the
> project she left here last year on a bunch of CD's was tracked up in your
> neighborhood on a DP system and she wanted to do some dubs here then remix
> the whole project. Then Bush was reelected and she totally wigged and moved
> to Kauai. I think she's into Linux'esque stuff quite a bit. Her dad is my
> dentist here and told me the other day that she's coming back to town (today
> or tomorrow) and wants to do some more work in the studio. I sold her my
> Ensoniq MR76 before she split and she had it shipped over to the islands so
> she's likely to have a bunch of midi songs to import into my MR Rack. I'll
> see if she will give me some Linux pointers between Christmas and the middle
> of January.

>
> Cheers,
>
> Deej
>
> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac8714$1@linux...
>
>>Hey Deej,
>>
>>Remember, for media production GNU\Linux is probably a non-starter. The 2D
>>graphic design is getting pretty good, basic video editing is also
>
> improving
>
>>notably, but all of the proprietary stuff that makes the audio world go
>
> 'round
>
>>(VST, ASIO, DX, Audio Units, etc.) is not there and won't be for a very
>
> long
>
>>time, if ever. But for the daily tasks that many computers do, web
>
> browsing,
>
>>emailing, writing, spreadsheets, and so on, GNU\Linux is not only there
>
> it's
>
>>BETTER than the proprietary options. OpenOffice.org is, in my opinion, a
>>notable improvement over any proprietary office suite out there. Evolution
>>is a superb email/contact/scheduling app that will sync nicely to Palm
>
> devices.
>
>>I work in an Outlook/Exchange centric office so I can't use it for work,
>>but all of the super hip Google Desktop "index my 2GB inbox for me so I
>
> can
>
>>do complex searches in two seconds" stuff has been in Evolution for years.
>>Then, on top of all of that "desktop" stuff, a basic Debian install will
>>also include PostgreSQL (enterprise class database), Apache (#1 web server
>>in the world), Perl/Python/PHP programming languages, an elegant and
>
> powerful
>

>>shell, enterprise class firewall/router tools, and about fifty thousand
>
> other
>
>>cool things that will allow you to take control over your computing world
>>in a way that you might never have before. You know those moments when you
>>think, "Crikey, I wish every time I booted the machine I didn't have to
>
> click
>
>>these same four boxes and start these same two apps." One quick shell
>
> script
>
>>and you'll never have to touch it again.
>>
>>The downside is that nobody is OBLIGATED to help you with computer
>
> problems.
>
>>I'll personally volunteer to do whatever I can to help you out if you'll
>>give a swing, but leaving Big Brother (be he Jobs or Gates) means none of
>>His underlings work on official help lines. If you want to get your first
>>taste (like most drugs the first taste is free, but unlike most drugs so
>>are all of the subsequent tastes) check out http://www.knoppix.org/ and
>
> http://www.ubuntulinux.org/download/
>
>>for some live CDs. Live CDs are great because you boot off the CD and can
>>take a look at what these distros are about. Knoppix is a great resource
>>even as an XP rescue CD and includes a very nicely implemented KDE
>
> desktop,
>
>>while Ubuntu is a great beginners distrobution that includes "Gnome done
>>right" and is very good about managing slightly funky video drivers. You
>>can try either without touching your base OS install to get an idea what
>>using GNU\Linux will be like. Both Knoppix and Ubuntu are Debian based, so
>>my knowledge will be fairly useful if you run into problems.
>>
>>The final downside is that once you're really in control of your computer
>>you won't ever want to use a proprietary OS again, ever. It will infuriate
>>you that someone else thinks he/she can tell you how an application should
>>run. You have been warned . . .
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>>
>>>I have been tempted for a while to start educating myself myself about
>>>Linux. i had sort of put that on the shelf and moved on ot other things.
>>>After reading Thad's posts, I'm once again interested and I just happen
>>
>>to
>>
>>>have about 90% of the components here to build another DAW. All I need is
>>
>>a
>>
>>>CDR, Floppy and PSU and I'm there.
>>>
>>>I may just jump into this.
>>>
>>>;o)
>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>>news:43ac68e1@linux...
>>>
>>>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>>Why not just talk about how "optimized"
>>>>>
>>>>>the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
>>>>>
>>>>>.....which is exactly the plan.
>>>>>
>>>>>;o)
>>>>
>>>>Apple's game is to sell you obsolescence so you will have to buy the
>
> next
>
>>>>box, but that is everybody's game not just apple. Job promised a G5
>>>
>>>PowerBook
>>>
>>>>to be available a year ago July, IBM dropped the ball. IBM couldn't
>>>
>>>deliver
>>>
>>>>a cool enough G5 to put in a lap top, they were also supposed to
>
> deliver
>
>>>>a G5 3Ghz+ at the same time. IBM still has not been able to pull
>
> either

>
>>>>off as of yet. That is why Apple went to a quad processor to stay on
>>
>>top.
>>
>>>> Apple had no good choice, but to exercise their option to go with
>
> Intel
>
>>>>chips. I for one welcome the idea of a cheaper, possibly faster, more
>>>
>>>upgradeable
>>>
>>>>Mac. However, I don't believe they will be all that much cheaper. My
>>>
>>>guess
>>>
>>>>is only 10-15% cheaper.
>>>>
>>>>I hope they open it up to AMD also, but I doubt it. As for OSX running
>>>
>>>faster
>>>
>>>>on an Intel chip, I hope it does! I'd still like to see some fair and
>>>
>>>balanced
>>>
>>>>tests showing a 3Ghz Celeron running OSX, and being able to smoke a G5.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>James

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Jamie K on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 01:07:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7 is
>
> shown
>
>>>>to
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec is used. Holds its own
>>>
>>>(their
>>>
>>>>>>>>>example, LightWave - more examples would be appreciated but

>
> that's
>
>>>>not
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>their focus). I use LW so it's pertinent to me.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>That's not what I read. What I read is that OS X is disastrous at
>>>>>
>>>>>managing
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>mutliple threads. Most, but not all, workstation apps use
>
> relatively
>
>>>>>few
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>threads. Something like LW or AfterEffects will usually be only
>>
>>a
>>
>>>few
>>>
>>>>>>threads
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>and the penalty for bad multi-threading will be minimal. Audio
>
> apps
>
>>>>are
>>>>
>>>>>>usually
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>more thread heavy than almost anything else that is "workstation"
>>>
>>>level
>>>
>>>>>>work,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>so the consistently reported miserable performance with DP might
>>>
>>>make
>>>
>>>>>>some
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>sense.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time. Its

>>>>>>>performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not "disastrous"
>>
>>in
>>
>>>>>>>real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is
>>>
>>>overstated
>>>
>>>>>>>when it comes what I need in a studio box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed with
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>>>>>G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I am
>>>>>>>keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it
>
> advances
>
>>>>in
>>>>
>>>>>>>those areas.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend to
>>>
>>>arguing
>>>
>>>>>>that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the proof
>>
>>for
>>
>>>>>which
>>>>>
>>>>>>you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient engine,
>>>
>>>you
>>>
>>>>>>telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing that
>>
>>it
>>
>>>>>gets
>>>>>
>>>>>>you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want it to,
>>>
>>>which

>>>
>>>>>>has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units on
>>
>>G5
>>
>>>>>chips
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering. So
>>
>>if
>>
>>>>>one
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers seem
>>>
>>>only
>>>
>>>>>>so
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor.
>
> This
>
>>>>>says
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>nothing about OS X performance, of course.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means
>
> minimal
>
>>>>>threading.
>>>>>
>>>>>>>In these tests it would seem so.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source software
>>>>>>>>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that specific
>>>>>
>>>>>choices
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would be
>>>>>

>>>>>interesting
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done anything
>>
>>to
>>
>>>>>>>>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited examples
>>>
>>>make
>>>
>>>>>>>>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is
>>>
>>>optimized
>>>
>>>>>>>>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not
>
> talking
>
>>>>quad
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the OS I
>>>
>>>can't
>>>
>>>>>>imagine
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>the situation is a lot better.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I dunno. We can speculate.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says Pete
>
> Leoni
>
>>>>>has
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's
>>>>>
>>>>>benchmarking
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on that,

>>
>>and
>>
>>>>I
>>>>
>>>>>>chime
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely inefficient
>>
>>in
>>
>>>>>some
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>areas that are crucial for high performance computing (threading,
>>>>>
>>>>>kernel
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths" and
>>>>>
>>>>>demands
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that they
>>
>>just
>>
>>>>>reflecty
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking
>>>
>>>commercial
>>>
>>>>>>>operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I have
>>
>>no
>>
>>>>>>>problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow Dog
>>>
>>>using
>>>
>>>>>>the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more than
>>
>>40
>>
>>>>>threads

>>>>>
>>>>>>or so. OS X does that all on its own.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would
>
> guess
>
>>>>is
>>>>
>>>>>>very
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware that
>>
>>is
>>
>>>>>leaning
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the
>>>
>>>chalkboard
>>>
>>>>>>in
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said,
>
> "Wow,
>
>>>>>what
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>a great way to destroy my database queries!"
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Linus is brilliant, of course.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>However, let's look at another
>>>>>>>>explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware. The
>>>>>
>>>>>developer
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>versions for Intel hardware seem distressingly fast in comparison
>>
>>to
>>
>>>>>supposedly
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early G4

>
> with
>
>>>>OS
>>>>
>>>>>>9 on
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>it remembers installing OS X and thinking, "Well it sure is
>
> pretty
>
>>>>but
>>>>
>>>>>>it
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>sure is slower too." At the time it was attributed to the new GUI
>>>
>>>but
>>>
>>>>>>now
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>that there's more evidence out there maybe that should be
>>>
>>>re-thought.
>>>
>>>>>>The
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>user space and kernel space on *nix machines is usually quite
>>>
>>>distinct,
>>>
>>>>>>so
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>do you think maybe Apple made some kernel changes in Intel OS X?
>>
>>I
>>
>>>>>don't
>>>>>
>>>>>>>have access to the software, so I can't say for sure if they've
>>>>>
>>>>>actually
>>>>>
>>>>>>>gone monolithic but from the benchmarks that would be a *highly*
>>>>>
>>>>>logical
>>>>>
>>>>>>>guess. If they haven't gone fully monolithic I would expect that

>>>
>>>they
>>>
>>>>>>lifted
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>some more code from a BSD licensed *nix to vastly improve the
>>>
>>>current
>>>
>>>>>>kernel
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>space. I'd still be on monolithic but it almost has to be one or
>>
>>the
>>
>>>>>other.
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Or maybe I'm just peddling urban myths . . .
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely it will
>>>>>>>change for PPC. We'll see.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Why is that likely? Why would Apple tell all of their PPC users that
>>>>>
>>>>>they've
>>>>>
>>>>>>been sucking up CPU cycles all of these years by using faulty kernel
>>>>>
>>>>>technology?
>>>>>
>>>>>>Why would they spend time on the kernel space of an operating system
>>>>>
>>>>>they've
>>>>>
>>>>>>already decided to drop in the end? Why not just talk about how
>>>>>
>>>>>"optimized"
>>>>>
>>>>>>the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>TCB
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>TCB
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very
>>>
>>>interesting
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX, in
>>>>>>>>>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that combination
>>>
>>>does.
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>This is all a moving target.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX is not
>>>
>>>open
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with his
>>>>>>>>>>specific statistical software he finds better performance under
>>>
>>>Linux
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this says
>>>
>>>much
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use (other
>>
>>than
>>
>>>>>his
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe he
>>>
>>>should
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine -
>
> although
>
>>>>they
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>may not have been out when he wrote his review - the HD one
>
> rocks).
>
>>>>>>>>>>But I can see why he made the choices he did for his application.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software I use
>>
>>for
>>
>>>>>>>>>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software
>>>
>>>development
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux
>>>>>>>>>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead, step
>>
>>by
>>
>>>>>>>>>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very
>>>
>>>capable
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ box
>>
>>I
>>
>>>use
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks for
>>>>>
>>>>>server
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio, video
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>graphics system-wide.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting to
>>>
>>>happen.
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie

>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Remember, in addition to what
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network admin
>>
>>and
>>
>>>>>developer.
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about
>
> this
>
>>>>>urban
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a) the
>>
>>G5
>>
>>>>is
>>>>
>>>>>>>>a fabulous
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices made
>>
>>in
>>
>>>>>kernel
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly
>>>>>
>>>>>mult-threaded
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>environments.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how Intel
>>>
>>>does
>>>
>>>>>>and
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30% slower

>>
>>than
>>
>>>>>the
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>same
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and
>
> about
>
>>>>the
>>>>
>>>>>>>>guy
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the
>>>
>>>supermodel
>>>
>>>>>>>>who
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written on
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>>>>hotel
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>bathroom mirror . . .
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>TCB
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Hey Thad,
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd be
>>>>>
>>>>>curious
>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>
>
>If you havent done so already, you might try disabling disk caching on your
drives. I havent had any assertion errors since I did this.
Edna

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:43ac8c32@linux...
> I'm doing basic recording on a fresh install and when I close Paris I'm
> getting blue screen hard crash with assertion errors. Is it ok to use
> an EDS mono delay on two adjacent channels while using stereo native
> effects? I would expect this to be ok and not the problem but having a
> totally fresh install with only a couple plugs it really frustrating. I
> even started with a new project not based on Default Project.ppj so I
> know it's not a corrupt project. Any help appreciated.
>
> Thanks,
> JohnJust turned 30. Single, musically talented, excellent genes, intelligent and
a massage therapist specializing in cranial sacral .....if you want to
hear one of her songs that she recorded in a studio in Boston, I'll shoot
you an MP3 via PM.

If I wasn't an old married dude.....

;o)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac8ece$1@linux...
>
> A female musican who knows about Ubuntu? Uh, is she single?
>
> ;-)
>
> TCB
>
> >> You have been warned . . .
> >>
> >
> >I'll take that as an encouragement ;o). It may be a couple of weeks
before
> I
> >can come up for air, but I've always wanted to get into this stuff. Also,

> >it's interesting about Ubuntu. I have a studio client whose nomme de
guerre
> >is Ubuntu. She is very savvy and actually, now that I think of it the
> >project she left here last year on a bunch of CD's was tracked up in your
> >neighborhood on a DP system and she wanted to do some dubs here then
remix
> >the whole project. Then Bush was reelected and she totally wigged and
moved
> >to Kauai. I think she's into Linux'esque stuff quite a bit. Her dad is my
> >dentist here and told me the other day that she's coming back to town
(today
> >or tomorrow) and wants to do some more work in the studio. I sold her my
> >Ensoniq MR76 before she split and she had it shipped over to the islands
> so
> >she's likely to have a bunch of midi songs to import into my MR Rack.
I'll
> >see if she will give me some Linux pointers between Christmas and the
middle
> >of January.
> >
> >Cheers,
> >
> >Deej
> >
> >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac8714$1@linux...
> >>
> >> Hey Deej,
> >>
> >> Remember, for media production GNU\Linux is probably a non-starter. The
> 2D
> >> graphic design is getting pretty good, basic video editing is also
> >improving
> >> notably, but all of the proprietary stuff that makes the audio world go
> >'round
> >> (VST, ASIO, DX, Audio Units, etc.) is not there and won't be for a very
> >long
> >> time, if ever. But for the daily tasks that many computers do, web
> >browsing,
> >> emailing, writing, spreadsheets, and so on, GNU\Linux is not only there
> >it's
> >> BETTER than the proprietary options. OpenOffice.org is, in my opinion,
> a
> >> notable improvement over any proprietary office suite out there.
Evolution
> >> is a superb email/contact/scheduling app that will sync nicely to Palm
> >devices.
> >> I work in an Outlook/Exchange centric office so I can't use it for
work,

> >> but all of the super hip Google Desktop "index my 2GB inbox for me so
> I
> >can
> >> do complex searches in two seconds" stuff has been in Evolution for
years.
> >> Then, on top of all of that "desktop" stuff, a basic Debian install
will
> >> also include PostgreSQL (enterprise class database), Apache (#1 web
server
> >> in the world), Perl/Python/PHP programming languages, an elegant and
> >powerful
> >> shell, enterprise class firewall/router tools, and about fifty thousand
> >other
> >> cool things that will allow you to take control over your computing
world
> >> in a way that you might never have before. You know those moments when
> you
> >> think, "Crikey, I wish every time I booted the machine I didn't have to
> >click
> >> these same four boxes and start these same two apps." One quick shell
> >script
> >> and you'll never have to touch it again.
> >>
> >> The downside is that nobody is OBLIGATED to help you with computer
> >problems.
> >> I'll personally volunteer to do whatever I can to help you out if
you'll
> >> give a swing, but leaving Big Brother (be he Jobs or Gates) means none
> of
> >> His underlings work on official help lines. If you want to get your
first
> >> taste (like most drugs the first taste is free, but unlike most drugs
> so
> >> are all of the subsequent tastes) check out http://www.knoppix.org/ and
> >http://www.ubuntulinux.org/download/
> >> for some live CDs. Live CDs are great because you boot off the CD and
> can
> >> take a look at what these distros are about. Knoppix is a great
resource
> >> even as an XP rescue CD and includes a very nicely implemented KDE
> >desktop,
> >> while Ubuntu is a great beginners distrobution that includes "Gnome
done
> >> right" and is very good about managing slightly funky video drivers.
You
> >> can try either without touching your base OS install to get an idea
what
> >> using GNU\Linux will be like. Both Knoppix and Ubuntu are Debian based,

> so
> >> my knowledge will be fairly useful if you run into problems.
> >>
> >> The final downside is that once you're really in control of your
computer
> >> you won't ever want to use a proprietary OS again, ever. It will
infuriate
> >> you that someone else thinks he/she can tell you how an application
should
> >> run. You have been warned . . .
> >>
> >> TCB
> >>
> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> >> >I have been tempted for a while to start educating myself myself about
> >> >Linux. i had sort of put that on the shelf and moved on ot other
things.
> >> >After reading Thad's posts, I'm once again interested and I just
happen
> >> to
> >> >have about 90% of the components here to build another DAW. All I need
> is
> >> a
> >> >CDR, Floppy and PSU and I'm there.
> >> >
> >> >I may just jump into this.
> >> >
> >> >;o)
> >> >"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:43ac68e1@linux...
> >> >>
> >> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> >> >> >>Why not just talk about how "optimized"
> >> >> >the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new hardware?
> >> >> >
> >> >> >.....which is exactly the plan.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >;o)
> >> >>
> >> >> Apple's game is to sell you obsolescence so you will have to buy the
> >next
> >> >> box, but that is everybody's game not just apple. Job promised a G5
> >> >PowerBook
> >> >> to be available a year ago July, IBM dropped the ball. IBM couldn't
> >> >deliver
> >> >> a cool enough G5 to put in a lap top, they were also supposed to
> >deliver
> >> >> a G5 3Ghz+ at the same time. IBM still has not been able to pull

> >either
> >> >> off as of yet. That is why Apple went to a quad processor to stay
> on
> >> top.
> >> >> Apple had no good choice, but to exercise their option to go with
> >Intel
> >> >> chips. I for one welcome the idea of a cheaper, possibly faster,
more
> >> >upgradeable
> >> >> Mac. However, I don't believe they will be all that much cheaper.
> My
> >> >guess
> >> >> is only 10-15% cheaper.
> >> >>
> >> >

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by Deej [1] on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 01:29:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

="_blank">Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >TCB wrote:
> >> >> >> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> >> >> >>>Looking at the links, Tiger 10.4.1 on a G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7 is
> >shown
> >> >> to
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec is used. Holds its own
> >> >(their
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>example, LightWave - more examples would be appreciated but
> >that's
> >> >> not
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>their focus). I use LW so it's pertinent to me.
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> That's not what I read. What I read is that OS X is disastrous
> at
> >> >> >managing
> >> >> >> >> mutliple threads. Most, but not all, workstation apps use
> >relatively
> >> >> >few
> >> >> >> >> threads. Something like LW or AfterEffects will usually be
only
> >> a
> >> >few

> >> >> >> threads
> >> >> >> >> and the penalty for bad multi-threading will be minimal. Audio
> >apps
> >> >> are
> >> >> >> usually
> >> >> >> >> more thread heavy than almost anything else that is
"workstation"
> >> >level
> >> >> >> work,
> >> >> >> >> so the consistently reported miserable performance with DP
might
> >> >make
> >> >> >> some
> >> >> >> >> sense.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time. Its
> >> >> >> >performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not
"disastrous"
> >> in
> >> >> >> >real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is
> >> >overstated
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >when it comes what I need in a studio box.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed
> with
> >> >the
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And I
> am
> >> >> >> >keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it
> >advances
> >> >> in
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >those areas.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend
> to
> >> >arguing
> >> >> >> that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the
proof
> >> for
> >> >> >which
> >> >> >> you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient
engine,
> >> >you

> >> >> >> telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing
> that
> >> it
> >> >> >gets
> >> >> >> you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want it
> to,
> >> >which
> >> >> >> has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >> The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units
> on
> >> G5
> >> >> >chips
> >> >> >> >> are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering.
> So
> >> if
> >> >> >one
> >> >> >> >> is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers
seem
> >> >only
> >> >> >> so
> >> >> >> >> so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor.
> >This
> >> >> >says
> >> >> >> >> nothing about OS X performance, of course.
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means
> >minimal
> >> >> >threading.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >In these tests it would seem so.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source
software
> >> >> >> >>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that
specific
> >> >> >choices
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would be
> >> >> >interesting
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done
anything
> >> to

> >> >> >> >>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited
examples
> >> >make
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is
> >> >optimized
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not
> >talking
> >> >> quad
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the OS
> I
> >> >can't
> >> >> >> imagine
> >> >> >> >> the situation is a lot better.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >I dunno. We can speculate.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >> So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says Pete
> >Leoni
> >> >> >has
> >> >> >> >> had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's
> >> >> >benchmarking
> >> >> >> >> the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on
that,
> >> and
> >> >> I
> >> >> >> chime
> >> >> >> >> in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely
inefficient
> >> in
> >> >> >some
> >> >> >> >> areas that are crucial for high performance computing
(threading,
> >> >> >kernel
> >> >> >> >> access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths"
> and
> >> >> >demands
> >> >> >> >> for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that
they
> >> just
> >> >> >reflecty

> >> >> >> >> my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking
> >> >commercial
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I
have
> >> no
> >> >> >> >problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow
> Dog
> >> >using
> >> >> >> the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more
than
> >> 40
> >> >> >threads
> >> >> >> or so. OS X does that all on its own.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >> OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would
> >guess
> >> >> is
> >> >> >> very
> >> >> >> >> appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware
> that
> >> is
> >> >> >leaning
> >> >> >> >> into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the
> >> >chalkboard
> >> >> >> in
> >> >> >> >> Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said,
> >"Wow,
> >> >> >what
> >> >> >> >> a great way to destroy my database queries!"
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >Linus is brilliant, of course.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > > However, let's look at another
> >> >> >> >> explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware.
> The
> >> >> >developer
> >> >> >> >> versions for Intel hardware seem distressingly fast in
comparison
> >> to
> >> >> >supposedly
> >> >> >> >> superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early G4

> >with
> >> >> OS
> >> >> >> 9 on
> >> >> >> >> it remembers installing OS X and thinking, "Well it sure is
> >pretty
> >> >> but
> >> >> >> it
> >> >> >> >> sure is slower too." At the time it was attributed to the new
> GUI
> >> >but
> >> >> >> now
> >> >> >> >> that there's more evidence out there maybe that should be
> >> >re-thought.
> >> >> >> The
> >> >> >> >> user space and kernel space on *nix machines is usually quite
> >> >distinct,
> >> >> >> so
> >> >> >> >> do you think maybe Apple made some kernel changes in Intel OS
> X?
> >> I
> >> >> >don't
> >> >> >> >> have access to the software, so I can't say for sure if
they've
> >> >> >actually
> >> >> >> >> gone monolithic but from the benchmarks that would be a
highly
> >> >> >logical
> >> >> >> >> guess. If they haven't gone fully monolithic I would expect
that
> >> >they
> >> >> >> lifted
> >> >> >> >> some more code from a BSD licensed *nix to vastly improve the
> >> >current
> >> >> >> kernel
> >> >> >> >> space. I'd still be on monolithic but it almost has to be one
> or
> >> the
> >> >> >other.
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> Or maybe I'm just peddling urban myths . . .
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely it
> will
> >> >> >> >change for PPC. We'll see.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> Why is that likely? Why would Apple tell all of their PPC users
> that

> >> >> >they've
> >> >> >> been sucking up CPU cycles all of these years by using faulty
kernel
> >> >> >technology?
> >> >> >> Why would they spend time on the kernel space of an operating
system
> >> >> >they've
> >> >> >> already decided to drop in the end? Why not just talk about how
> >> >> >"optimized"
> >> >> >> the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new
hardware?
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> TCB
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >Cheers,
> >> >> >> > -Jamie
> >> >> >> > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> >> TCB
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very
> >> >interesting
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX,
> in
> >> >> >> >>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that
combination
> >> >does.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>This is all a moving target.
> >> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >> >>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX is
> not
> >> >open
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with
> his
> >> >> >> >>>specific statistical software he finds better performance
under
> >> >Linux
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this
> says
> >> >much
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use

(other
> >> than
> >> >> >his
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe
> he
> >> >should
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine -
> >although
> >> >> they
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>> may not have been out when he wrote his review - the HD one
> >rocks).
> >> >> >> >>>But I can see why he made the choices he did for his
application.
> >> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >> >>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software I
use
> >> for
> >> >> >> >>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software
> >> >>development
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux
> >> >> >> >>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead,
> step
> >> by
> >> >> >> >>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
> >> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >> >>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very
> >> >>capable
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ
box
> >> I
> >> >use
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks
> for
> >> >> >server
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio,
video
> >> >and
> >> >> >>

> >> >> >> >>>graphics system-wide.
> >> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >> >>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting to
> >> >happen.
> >> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >> >>>Cheers,
> >> >> >> >>> -Jamie
> >> >> >> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >> >>>Remember, in addition to what
> >> >> >> >>>
> >> >> >> >>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network
admin
> >> and
> >> >> >developer.
> >> >> >> >>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about
> >this
> >> >> >urban
> >> >> >> >>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves a)
> the
> >> G5
> >> >> is
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> a fabulous
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices
made
> >> in
> >> >> >kernel
> >> >> >> >>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly
> >> >> >mult-threaded
> >> >> >> >>>>environments.
> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how
Intel
> >> >does
> >> >> >> and
> >> >> >> >>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30%
slower
> >> than
> >> >> >the
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> same
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.

> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and
> >about
> >> >> the
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> guy
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the
> >> >supermodel
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >> who
> >> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written
> on
> >> >the
> >> >> >> hotel
> >> >> >> >>>>bathroom mirror . . .
> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>TCB
> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>>Hey Thad,
> >> >> >> >>>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend. I'd
> be
> >> >> >curious
> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
> >> >> >> >>>>>
> >> >> >> >>>>>Cheers,
> >> >> >> >>>>>-Jamie
> >> >> >> >>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >
> >
>I hope Santa brings you some goodies, What did everyone ask for?
 I asked for a manley ELOP and the Chander Germanium pre, I wonder if the
elves can make U47s. By the way is there a differnece between an elf and

a faery? DO they hang wiht Dwarves?

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>Tony,
>
>Take care on your trip and have a good one.
>
>Deej
>
>"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>news:43ac8956@linux...
>> Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this
>weekend
>> and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night.
If
>> not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not the
PC
>> thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it in
the
>> spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're offended,
>> then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in your travels,
>show
>> respect, and cherish the people you love.
>>
>> Peace,
>>
>> Tony
>>
>>
>
>I asked for Nuendo and CuBase and Kontakt and Halion and Wavelab and RME
56xx and Reaktor and Absynth and Acid and Reason and a partridge. . . . . -
actually I used to raise partridges, and they are delicious.
Happy holidays to everyone!

"Cujo" <chris@nospamapplemanstudio.com> wrote in message
news:43acacb3$1@linux...
>
>
>
> I hope Santa brings you some goodies, What did everyone ask for?
> I asked for a manley ELOP and the Chander Germanium pre, I wonder if the
> elves can make U47s. By the way is there a differnece between an elf and
> a faery? DO they hang wiht Dwarves?
>
>

>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> >Tony,
> >
> >Take care on your trip and have a good one.
> >
> >Deej
> >
> >"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
> >news:43ac8956@linux...
> >> Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this
> >weekend
> >> and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night.
> If
> >> not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not the
> PC
> >> thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it in
> the
> >> spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're
offended,
> >> then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in your travels,
> >show
> >> respect, and cherish the people you love.
> >>
> >> Peace,
> >>
> >> Tony
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Chas, the system must first see the cd/dvd drive before it can be updated.
Maybe you can try "Find new hardware" one more time manually and not
automatic, to see if there's some cd drivers to install. Also see if
"mscdex.exe" and "mscdrom.cat" are missing in your Windows System maps a
place. Maybe it needs to be reinstalled from the compressed CAB files. Maybe
have Windows installed the compressed CAB files a place in the Windows map
to search in, as in WinME. If not, you will find them in some of the
compressed CABfiles on the Win98 installation CD. Maybe you must use WinXP
to look and search in those CAB's to find the missing files and copy them to
a place on the harddisk where also Win98 can find them to be reinstalled in
their correct maps. Hope some of these ideas can be a helping hand.

Erling

"Chas. Duncan" <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> skrev i melding
news:ciuoq1hl226uvmr6cqrfn7kfibbni1jfqg@4ax.com...
> Erling -- thanks -- yes I tried the "new hardware" idea... Windows
> didn't see it... Not sure what my next move is...

>
> Also -- thanks for the Steinberg link -- that was the first thing I
> tried though... Didn't work (or: I did something wrong -- always a
> strong possibility). Anyway -- my problem now is the larger one that
> I've managed to "lose" the cd drive entirely -- at least as far as my
> 98 partition is concerned...
>
> Any other thoughts? thanks again -- Chas.
>
> On Fri, 23 Dec 2005 19:51:50 +0100, "erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote:
>
>>If you go here you can update the CD/DVD recorder in Wavelab:
>> http://www.steinberg.de/DocSupportDisplay_sbc88b.html?templ=
&doclink=/webvideo/Steinberg/support/doc/updates_applica
tions_pro_pc_en.html&Langue_ID=&Product_ID=
>>
>>Have you tried to find the CD burner again in "Find new hardware" in the
>>Control Panel "?
>>
>>Erling
>>
>>"Chas. Duncan" <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> skrev i melding
>>news:mueoq1lgph2loia7qtui0qef54bn53m3r4@4ax.com...
>>> Hi people, and Happy Holidays to one and all...
>>>
>>> Sort of OT -- I have a dual-boot set-up on my non-Paris computer, with
>>> a 98SE partition just so I can run my older version of Wavelab
>>> (3.1)... 2nd partition is XP for Cubase SX3.
>>>
>>> I've had a problem with Wavelab "seeing" the cd drive -- it can read
>>> from it no problem, but if I try to write I get an empty drop-down in
>>> the "connected devices" box -- no joy.
>>>
>>> Anyway, yesterday I was messing around, trying to load updated drivers
>>> for that drive on the 98 partition -- and now I've managed to "lose"
>>> that drive completely for that OS -- Device Manager doesn't list it
>>> --it's gone... All is well on the XP partition...
>>>
>>> Is this going need a re-load of 98? Would like to keep this thing
>>> going, just to avoid spending the money to upgrade Wavelab to an
>>> XP-friendly flavor (and don't want to pay for DVD and surround
>>> features I have no use for)...
>>>
>>> thanks in advance for any advice -- chas
>>>
>>
>i just want to be the great puppet master who pulls all the strings in
the universe or...a jar of really good peanut butter...either will do.

merry christmas

On Fri, 23 Dec 2005 21:02:41 -0600, "Edna" <edna@texomaonline.com>
wrote:

>I asked for Nuendo and CuBase and Kontakt and Halion and Wavelab and RME
>56xx and Reaktor and Absynth and Acid and Reason and a partridge. . . . . -
>actually I used to raise partridges, and they are delicious.
>Happy holidays to everyone!
>
>"Cujo" <chris@nospamapplemanstudio.com> wrote in message
>news:43acacb3$1@linux...
>>
>>
>>
>> I hope Santa brings you some goodies, What did everyone ask for?
>> I asked for a manley ELOP and the Chander Germanium pre, I wonder if the
>> elves can make U47s. By the way is there a differnece between an elf and
>> a faery? DO they hang wiht Dwarves?
>>
>>
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >Tony,
>> >
>> >Take care on your trip and have a good one.
>> >
>> >Deej
>> >
>> >"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>> >news:43ac8956@linux...
>> >> Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this
>> >weekend
>> >> and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night.
>> If
>> >> not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not the
>> PC
>> >> thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it in
>> the
>> >> spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're
>offended,
>> >> then may I at least wish

Subject: Re: Mac OSX running on a PC
Posted by TCB on Sat, 24 Dec 2005 18:22:40 GMT

>> >> >> Mac. However, I don't believe they will be all that much cheaper.
>> My
>> >> >guess
>> >> >> is only 10-15% cheaper.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I hope they open it up to AMD also, but I doubt it. As for OSX
>running
>> >> >faster
>> >> >> on an Intel chip, I hope it does! I'd still like to see some fair
>> and
>> >> >balanced
>> >> >> tests showing a 3Ghz Celeron running OSX, and being able to smoke
a
>> G5.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >> James
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:43ac40b4$1@linux...
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >TCB wrote:
>> >> >> >> >> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >> >> >> >>>Looking at the links, Tiger 10.4.1 on a G5 dual 2.5 or 2.7
is
>> >shown
>> >> >> to
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>be OK for workstation apps when altivec is used. Holds its
own
>> >> >(their
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>example, LightWave - more examples would be appreciated but
>> >that's
>> >> >> not
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>their focus). I use LW so it's pertinent to me.
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >> That's not what I read. What I read is that OS X is disastrous
>> at
>> >> >> >managing
>> >> >> >> >> mutliple threads. Most, but not all, workstation apps use

>> >relatively
>> >> >> >few
>> >> >> >> >> threads. Something like LW or AfterEffects will usually be
>only
>> >> a
>> >> >few
>> >> >> >> threads
>> >> >> >> >> and the penalty for bad multi-threading will be minimal. Audio
>> >apps
>> >> >> are
>> >> >> >> usually
>> >> >> >> >> more thread heavy than almost anything else that is
>"workstation"
>> >> >level
>> >> >> >> work,
>> >> >> >> >> so the consistently reported miserable performance with DP
>might
>> >> >make
>> >> >> >> some
>> >> >> >> >> sense.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >I dunno. Logic runs tons of tracks and plugins in real time.
Its
>> >> >> >> >performance is hardly "disastrous." Final Cut is not
>"disastrous"
>> >> in
>> >> >> >> >real life performance. Etc. So perhaps this achilles heel is
>> >> >overstated
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >when it comes what I need in a studio box.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >Maybe because I started on an Atari 800XL, I'm quite impressed
>> with
>> >> >the
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >G5 or OSX in the studio. :^)
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >However, if I were running a server, there Linux is king. And
I
>> am
>> >> >> >> >keeping an eye Linux for future media production use, as it
>> >advances
>> >> >> in
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >those areas.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> OK, so now we've gone from accusing me of peddling urban legend
>> to

>> >> >arguing
>> >> >> >> that your Mac works for you, becuase I provided precisely the
>proof
>> >> for
>> >> >> >which
>> >> >> >> you asked. That's like me saying your car has an inefficient
>engine,
>> >> >you
>> >> >> >> telling me I'm full of it, me showing you, and then you arguing
>> that
>> >> it
>> >> >> >gets
>> >> >> >> you to and from work. Fine, your Mac gets done what you want
it
>> to,
>> >> >which
>> >> >> >> has nothing to do with the question that was originally posed.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >> The other thing this article points out is that the FPU units
>> on
>> >> G5
>> >> >> >chips
>> >> >> >> >> are pedestrian while the vector processor is truly staggering.
>> So
>> >> if
>> >> >> >one
>> >> >> >> >> is going to hand tune for vector processing (most compilers
>seem
>> >> >only
>> >> >> >> so
>> >> >> >> >> so at doing that) that's another mark majorly in the G5 favor.
>> >This
>> >> >> >says
>> >> >> >> >> nothing about OS X performance, of course.
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >> So it's good for "workstation" as long as workstation means
>> >minimal
>> >> >> >threading.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >In these tests it would seem so.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >>>They give thumbs down on server apps using open source
>software
>> >> >> >> >>>(apparently not optimized for OSX?), and point out that
>specific
>> >> >> >choices

>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>in the kernel are shown to be slower than Linux. It would
be
>> >> >> >interesting
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>to see if the several OSX updates since then have done
>anything
>> >> to
>> >> >> >> >>>address that. For my use as a workstation, their limited
>examples
>> >> >make
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>it look like OSX on G5 is not a bad choice when software is
>> >> >optimized
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>for altivec. Actually it looked pretty good. And we're not
>> >talking
>> >> >> quad
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>mac here which conceivably would be some amount better yet.
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >> Well, unless Apple changed the kernel and, oh, most of the
OS
>> I
>> >> >can't
>> >> >> >> imagine
>> >> >> >> >> the situation is a lot better.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >I dunno. We can speculate.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >> So then, let's get back to the original post. Morgan says
Pete
>> >Leoni
>> >> >> >has
>> >> >> >> >> had OS X running on pretty junky X86 hardware and that it's
>> >> >> >benchmarking
>> >> >> >> >> the daylights out of G5 boxes. A Mac enthusiast says BS on
>that,
>> >> and
>> >> >> I
>> >> >> >> chime
>> >> >> >> >> in that Morgan may be right because OS X is extremely
>inefficient

>> >> in
>> >> >> >some
>> >> >> >> >> areas that are crucial for high performance computing
>(threading,
>> >> >> >kernel
>> >> >> >> >> access, etc.). I'm told that I'm passing around "urban myths"
>> and
>> >> >> >demands
>> >> >> >> >> for proof are made. After the proof is given I'm told that
>they
>> >> just
>> >> >> >reflecty
>> >> >> >> >> my "bias" as someone who likes Debian.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >Not "just." You clearly explained your reasons for disliking
>> >> >commercial
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >operating systems and your reasons for liking open source. I
>have
>> >> no
>> >> >> >> >problem with that. It's a bias, but a supportable one.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> Well, my bias doesn't make OS X perform 1/10th as well as Yellow
>> Dog
>> >> >using
>> >> >> >> the same hardware when crunching MySQL queries that spawn more
>than
>> >> 40
>> >> >> >threads
>> >> >> >> or so. OS X does that all on its own.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >> OK, that's one way to explain things, and a way that I would
>> >guess
>> >> >> is
>> >> >> >> very
>> >> >> >> >> appealing to someone in for a few grand worth of G5 hardware
>> that
>> >> is
>> >> >> >leaning
>> >> >> >> >> into the headwind of kernel design that looked great on the
>> >> >chalkboard
>> >> >> >> in
>> >> >> >> >> Comp Sci 310: Mach Kernel Development but Linus saw and said,
>> >"Wow,
>> >> >> >what
>> >> >> >> >> a great way to destroy my database queries!"
>> >> >> >> >

>> >> >> >> >Linus is brilliant, of course.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> > > However, let's look at another
>> >> >> >> >> explanation. Apple is plannning on moving to Intel hardware.
>> The
>> >> >> >developer
>> >> >> >> >> versions for Intel hardware seem distressingly fast in
>comparison
>> >> to
>> >> >> >supposedly
>> >> >> >> >> superior chip design from IBM. Everyone who owned an early
G4
>> >with
>> >> >> OS
>> >> >> >> 9 on
>> >> >> >> >> it remembers installing OS X and thinking, "Well it sure is
>> >pretty
>> >> >> but
>> >> >> >> it
>> >> >> >> >> sure is slower too." At the time it was attributed to the
new
>> GUI
>> >> >but
>> >> >> >> now
>> >> >> >> >> that there's more evidence out there maybe that should be
>> >> >re-thought.
>> >> >> >> The
>> >> >> >> >> user space and kernel space on *nix machines is usually quite
>> >> >distinct,
>> >> >> >> so
>> >> >> >> >> do you think maybe Apple made some kernel changes in Intel
OS
>> X?
>> >> I
>> >> >> >don't
>> >> >> >> >> have access to the software, so I can't say for sure if
>they've
>> >> >> >actually
>> >> >> >> >> gone monolithic but from the benchmarks that would be a
>*highly*
>> >> >> >logical
>> >> >> >> >> guess. If they haven't gone fully monolithic I would expect
>that
>> >> >they
>> >> >> >> lifted
>> >> >> >> >> some more code from a BSD licensed *nix to vastly improve
the

>> >> >current
>> >> >> >> kernel
>> >> >> >> >> space. I'd still be on monolithic but it almost has to be
one
>> or
>> >> the
>> >> >> >other.
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >> Or maybe I'm just peddling urban myths . . .
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >Maybe. :^) If the kernel has changed for Intel, it's likely
it
>> will
>> >> >> >> >change for PPC. We'll see.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> Why is that likely? Why would Apple tell all of their PPC users
>> that
>> >> >> >they've
>> >> >> >> been sucking up CPU cycles all of these years by using faulty
>kernel
>> >> >> >technology?
>> >> >> >> Why would they spend time on the kernel space of an operating
>system
>> >> >> >they've
>> >> >> >> already decided to drop in the end? Why not just talk about how
>> >> >> >"optimized"
>> >> >> >> the new X86 version of OS X is and make everyone buy new
>hardware?
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> TCB
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >Cheers,
>> >> >> >> > -Jamie
>> >> >> >> > http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> >> TCB
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>OTOH, the Opteron looked pretty good, too. It will be very
>> >> >interesting
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>to look at the upcoming Intel dual Yonah processor with OSX,
>> in
>> >> >> >> >>>(rumored) another couple of weeks, and see how that
>combination
>> >> >does.

>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>This is all a moving target.
>> >> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >> >>>In the other link, the main bias is the same as yours: OSX
is
>> not
>> >> >open
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>source from top to bottom. True. Beyond that complaint, with
>> his
>> >> >> >> >>>specific statistical software he finds better performance
>under
>> >> >Linux
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>when testing on a couple of older G5 boxes. Not sure if this
>> says
>> >> >much
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>about the music/graphics/video/animation apps that I use
>(other
>> >> than
>> >> >> >his
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>complaint about accessing his PVR files, in which case maybe
>> he
>> >> >should
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>consider the ElGato digital video boxes which work fine -
>> >although
>> >> >> they
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>> may not have been out when he wrote his review - the HD one
>> >rocks).
>> >> >> >> >>>But I can see why he made the choices he did for his
>application.
>> >> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >> >>>It's good to have choices. Go Linux! Some of the software
I
>use
>> >> for
>> >> >> >> >>>browsing, email, word processing, spreadsheet and software
>> >> >development
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>also run on Linux and I like that. BTW, I'm happy to see Linux
>> >> >> >> >>>animation, audio, video, and graphics software moving ahead,
>> step

>> >> by
>> >> >> >> >>>step. If you're involved in any of that, kudos to you!
>> >> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >> >>>For now, OSX and the available software for OSX offers a very
>> >> >capable
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>platform for the media production I do, and the dual 2.5GHZ
>box
>> >> I
>> >> >use
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>is, for the most part, amazing. The kernel may have drawbacks
>> for
>> >> >> >server
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>use, but it has some very nice features that support audio,
>video
>> >> >and
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>graphics system-wide.
>> >> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >> >>>It's not perfect, mind you. That's still out there waiting
to
>> >> >happen.
>> >> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >> >>>Cheers,
>> >> >> >> >>> -Jamie
>> >> >> >> >>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >> >>>Remember, in addition to what
>> >> >> >> >>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>I do with audio apps I work 50-80 hour weeks as a network
>admin
>> >> and
>> >> >> >developer.
>> >> >> >> >>>>And I hate M$oft just as much as I hate Apple. So then, about
>> >this
>> >> >> >urban
>> >> >> >> >>>>legend nonsense, I give you Anandtech, wherein he proves
a)
>> the
>> >> G5
>> >> >> is
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >> a fabulous
>> >> >> >> >>

>> >> >> >> >>>>RISC processor and that b) thanks to some very bad choices
>made
>> >> in
>> >> >> >kernel
>> >> >> >> >>>>development and implementation OS X hamstrings it in highly
>> >> >> >mult-threaded
>> >> >> >> >>>>environments.
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>http://www.anandtech.com/mac/showdoc.aspx?i=2436
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>Then benchmarks run by a fine fellow in Berkely. Skip how
>Intel
>> >> >does
>> >> >> >> and
>> >> >> >> >>>>note that the same machine running OS X performs 25-30%
>slower
>> >> than
>> >> >> >the
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >> same
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>>hardware running Yellow Dog Linux.
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>http://sekhon.polisci.berkeley.edu/macosx/
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>Now, let me tell you that masturbation causes blindness and
>> >about
>> >> >> the
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >> guy
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>>who woke up in a bathtub full of ice short a kidney and the
>> >> >supermodel
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >> who
>> >> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> >>>>banged me and then left "Welcome to AIDS" in lipstick written
>> on
>> >> >the
>> >> >> >> hotel
>> >> >> >> >>>>bathroom mirror . . .
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>TCB
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>>Hey Thad,

>> >> >> >> >>>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>>I'm all for Gnu/Linux but that sounds like urban legend.
I'd
>> be
>> >> >> >curious
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>>to check out the evidence you mention. Any URLs?
>> >> >> >> >>>>>
>> >> >> >> >>>>>Cheers,
>> >> >> >> >>>>>-Jamie
>> >> >> >> >>>>>http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>Merry Christmas to you all!

It's actually a bit hot out here in SoCal..

nutz

DCMerry Christmas to all here, also. While I don't post
a whole lot, I am here everyday checking it out, and
feel a part of this goofy family, and appreciate each
and every one of y'all.

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this weekend

>and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night.
If
>not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not the PC

>thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it in the

>spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're offended,

>then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in your travels, show

>respect, and cherish the people you love.
>
>Peace,
>
>Tony
>
>Oh Trader Joes soynut butter.
Part of my road cycling diet. I just had a sandwich with blueberry preserves!
Yum. (Blueberrys are very good for you,)
I have doe a blind A/B test with other sandwich spreads and I find the Soynut
to have a tad more punch in the mids and less flabby in the lows, of course
I use the crunchy for a bit more agressive edge, but the creamy will make
you think there is a vintage Mullard in there.

rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:
>i just want to be the great puppet master who pulls all the strings in
>the universe or...a jar of really good peanut butter...either will do.
>
>merry christmas
>
>On Fri, 23 Dec 2005 21:02:41 -0600, "Edna" <edna@texomaonline.com>
>wrote:
>
>>I asked for Nuendo and CuBase and Kontakt and Halion and Wavelab and RME
>>56xx and Reaktor and Absynth and Acid and Reason and a partridge. . . .
. -
>>actually I used to raise partridges, and they are delicious.
>>Happy holidays to everyone!
>>
>>"Cujo" <chris@nospamapplemanstudio.com> wrote in message
>>news:43acacb3$1@linux...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> I hope Santa brings you some goodies, What did everyone ask for?
>>> I asked for a manley ELOP and the Chander Germanium pre, I wonder if
the
>>> elves can make U47s. By the way is there a differnece between an elf
and
>>> a faery? DO they hang wiht Dwarves?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>> >Tony,
>>> >

>>> >Take care on your trip and have a good one.
>>> >
>>> >Deej
>>> >
>>> >"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
>>> >news:43ac8956@linux...
>>> >> Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this
>>> >weekend
>>> >> and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night.
>>> If
>>> >> not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not
the
>>> PC
>>> >> thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it
in
>>> the
>>> >> spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're
>>offended,
>>> >> then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in your travels,
>>> >show
>>> >> respect, and cherish the people you love.
>>> >>
>>> >> Peace,
>>> >>
>>> >> Tony
>>> >>
>>> >>
>>> >
>>> >
>>
>Yes, Merry whatever you celebrate to anybody who cares to celebrate! :o)
May there be much merryment! May you all get a new EDS card and Paris 4.0!
:o)

Cheers,
Kim.

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this weekend

>and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night.
If
>not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not the PC

>thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it in the

>spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're offended,

>then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in your travels, show

>respect, and cherish the people you love.
>
>Peace,
>
>Tony
>
>Merry happy back atcha, everyone!

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

Kim wrote:
> Yes, Merry whatever you celebrate to anybody who cares to celebrate! :o)
> May there be much merryment! May you all get a new EDS card and Paris 4.0!
> :o)
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.
>
> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>
>>Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this weekend
>
>
>>and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night.
>
> If
>
>>not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not the PC
>
>
>>thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it in the
>
>
>>spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're offended,
>
>
>>then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in your travels, show
>
>
>>respect, and cherish the people you love.
>>
>>Peace,
>>

>>Tony
>>
>>
>
>Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year to all of you and your beloved ones.
Dimitrios

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this weekend

>and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday night.
If
>not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's not the PC

>thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I say it in the

>spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If you're offended,

>then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in your travels, show

>respect, and cherish the people you love.
>
>Peace,
>
>Tony
>
>As they say in Hawaii, " Mele Kalikimaka "

Bill L

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
news:43ac8956@linux...
> Well, I'm getting ready to leave for all the family gatherings this
> weekend and don't know if I'll have access to the web again until Monday
> night. If not, here's wishing everyone here Merry Christmas. I know it's
> not the PC thing to do anymore, but I don't say it to exclude anyone. I
> say it in the spirit of brotherly love no matter what your beliefs. If
> you're offended, then may I at least wish you Happy Holidays. Be safe in
> your travels, show respect, and cherish the people you love.
>
> Peace,
>
> Tony
>One of my Christmas presents to myself is going to be a VSTi host program. I
have played around with Kontact and Halion a little, but this was with older
programs and it was a while back. I want something that is going to be as
friendly with Cubase SX as possible. I'm not really into synths so much. the
project work I'm going to be doing here is based more on acoustic

instruments and I'd like to have a nice B3 for bluesy stuff from time to time.

I have played around a little bit with older versions of Halion and Kontact. I don't really know my way around them enough to know their strong suits. what I need is something that has really good piano, orchestral and percussion libraries.

I have thought about getting the East West Bosendorfer 290, but it's a standalone. (I have heard this.....it is scary realistic)

I have also thought about The Grand from Steinberg, but again this is a standalone.

I have also thought about getting the Gold Orchestral Bundle from East West, but again, that's a standalone.

I would like to have the NI B-4 as well.

Soooo.....my question is, given the needs set out above, could I possibly fullfill these by purchasing Halio