
Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-REALITY CHECK
Posted by [Music Lab Sweden](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 19:18:29 GMT

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

Hi All,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Just my 2 cents.

Babu

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 23:48:55 GMT

"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

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

Then you don't know how to use Paris, and I have the tracks to prove it.

Samplitude is competitive with Paris on orchestras, Nuendo is not.

DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 00:24:19 GMT

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

Hey DC - have you qualified what you didn't like, or didn't work with Nuendo for classical? I'm curious from a technical perspective, regardless of preferences, and not to spark further debate over which is "best". I have found noticeable differences in how Samplitude handles gain vs. Nuendo, although at unity gain, they sum identically. Thanks!

Regards,
Dedric

On 4/14/06 5:48 PM, in article 444034e7\$1 @linux, "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:

>
> "Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:
>
>
>> Anyway, I agree with most of the comments about Paris and it's sound but
>> when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left so desire.
> It
>> nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT,
>> Soundscape,
>> Nuendo, Samplitude etc.
>
>

> Then you don't know how to use Paris, and I have the tracks to prove it.
>
> Samplitude is competitive with Paris on orchestras, Nuendo is not.
>
>
> DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 00:47:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Best" is unknowable unless someone recorded the same orchestra with the same mics, pres, and convertors at the same performance.

What I know is that I have mastered and recorded over 200 classical CD's and Paris sounds even better than Sonic, which I can nearly use blindfolded. This with the exact same material from the same source DAT tape. Both examples were flown in, in real-time from a Sony 2800 DAT player, one into Sonic one into Paris. Paris sounded better.

No, you can't record classical with Paris on-site using the onboard convertors and expect perfect results, but what you can do is record to any of the good portable media we have today, bring the material back and fly it in on sp/dif, then post and master using the source deck as clock. Do not push the levels like in pop music, and if you have a good ear for EQ you can get results that are spectacular.

Greatness in classical is not measured by summing tests or checksums, but by the conductor. (One of my conductors heard a change in mic cables without my prompting) It's VERY hard to capture an orchestra with 2 mics live to 2 track. If you know how to do it though, the results are nearly perfect. Be aware, only one "recording engineer" in 50 or so can hear as well as a great conductor, so a lot of guys make fools of themselves trying to BS the client. When it is wrong, they hear it in 3 seconds, and no amount of techno-gibberish will save you, and when it is gloriously right, you have a friend for life.

As for Nuendo, my experience is limited to demos and trade shows where it sounded so bad I walked away on more than 5 different occasions. And yes you can hear at trade shows. Funny how Sonic, Paris, and Sequoia all sounded great at trade shows. My classical colleagues have pretty much returned the same verdict. I don't know anyone who seriously uses Nuendo. A lot of people are using PT's now, but many are using Sequoia, and I am headed that way in the next few years.

Great sound on orchestras is easy in Paris, you just have to know how to use it. I also did a live project recently where I dragged out the Paris rig and recorded live to 24-track and it sounds fabulous. I did the drums with 4 mics, one on the snare, one in the kick, and stereo overheads. So far, I am mixing it clean, and it sounds just sweet and pristine. No fake "warmth" no analog fuzziness, no middines, just great sound. I'll send you one when we are done if you like.

DC

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Hey DC - have you qualified what you didn't like, or didn't work with Nuendo
>for classical? I'm curious from a technical perspective, regardless of
>preferences, and not to spark further debate over which is "best". I have
>found noticeable differences in how Samplitude handles gain vs. Nuendo,
>although at unity gain, they sum identically. Thanks!

>

>Regards,

>Dedric

>

>On 4/14/06 5:48 PM, in article 444034e7\$1@linux, "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com>
>wrote:

>

>>

>> "Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>>

>>

but

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

>> It

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

>>> Soundscape,

>>> Nuendo, Samplitude etc.

>>

>>

>> Then you don't know how to use Paris, and I have the tracks to prove it.

>>

>> Samplitude is competitive with Paris on orchestras, Nuendo is not.

>>

>>

>> DC

>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 03:34:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey DC - I agree - "best" is an unknown that is 90% subjective and 10% objective, unless side by side comparison is made with completely identical conditions, which is often quite difficult, if not impossible. Lynn Fuston is one of the few to attempt that with DAWs on a large scale. You might be surprised at how many unity gain mixes I found to cancel completely (all 24-bits). Samplitude, Nuendo, and PTHD I believe (Paris didn't cancel with anything that I recall).

I can easily see Sequoia being a popular choice for classical with it's superb editing capabilities - that's also apparent from their testimonials list. I may head that way for some of the more advanced editing and mixing capabilities at some point, though Nuendo is so far superior for music production/scoring.

From what I've heard even on the Nuendo forum, the show demos seem to be plagued with badness. The demos that come with Nuendo don't come close to doing it justice, other than demonstrating such things as Play Order tracks and looping, but certainly not sound quality or quality production (some were embarrassing). One Nuendo forum member recently used a 2.2 demo for some testing. When pulling out the files individually as I was running some performance comparisons on my own, one track had pops and clicks throughout - in the track, not my system - due to rendering problems with the creator's sound card no doubt. Now, to use that as a demo, and even a test case for performance and listening for pops and clicks? Pretty short sighted, but certainly worse than Steinberg would send it out as a demo. Then again, many product demos are obviously thrown together with little more intent than to show a few features.

I wouldn't judge Nuendo or any product's sound quality on a noisy tradeshow floor. Nuendo can deliver just as easily as any other DAW from my experience - it's all in how you use it, as with any other. At the same time I have no interest in convincing you otherwise on your opinion of it because it really doesn't matter to either one of us - you have what works great for you so anything else is a waste of your money and time, imho. No one really cares if Nuendo, Paris or PTHD recorded Mozart's Requiem - just that it sounds superb. For me, it's just about what does the job I need, and making sure that doesn't include an unsatisfactory compromise.

Sure, I would be very interested to hear the live project.

Regards,
Dedric

On 4/14/06 6:47 PM, in article 444042a6\$1@linux, "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:

>
> "Best" is unknowable unless someone recorded the same orchestra
> with the same mics, pres, and convertors at the same performance.
>
> What I know is that I have mastered and recorded over 200 classical
> CD's and Paris sounds even better than Sonic, which I can nearly use
> blindfolded. This with the exact same material from the same source
> DAT tape. Both examples were flown in, in real-time from a Sony
> 2800 DAT player, one into Sonic one into Paris. Paris sounded
> better.
>
> No, you can't record classical with Paris on-site using the onboard
> convertors and expect perfect results, but what you can do is record
> to any of the good portable media we have today, bring the material
> back and fly it in on sp/dif, then post and master using the source
> deck as clock. Do not push the levels like in pop music, and if you
> have a good ear for EQ you can get results that are spectacular.
>
> Greatness in classical is not measured by summing tests or
> checksums, but by the conductor. (One of my conductors heard a
> change in mic cables without my prompting) It's VERY hard to
> capture an orchestra with 2 mics live to 2 track. If you know how
> to do it though, the results are nearly perfect. Be aware, only
> one "recording engineer" in 50 or so can hear as well as a great
> conductor, so a lot of guys make fools of themselves trying to BS
> the client. When it is wrong, they hear it in 3 seconds, and no
> amount of techno-gibberish will save you, and when it is gloriously
> right, you have a friend for life.
>
> As for Nuendo, my experience is limited to demos and trade shows
> where it sounded so bad I walked away on more than 5 different
> occasions. And yes you can hear at trade shows. Funny how Sonic,
> Paris, and Sequoia all sounded great at trade shows.
> My classical colleagues have pretty much returned the same
> verdict. I don't know anyone who seriously uses Nuendo. A lot
> of people are using PT's now, but many are using Sequoia, and I am
> headed that way in the next few years.
>
> Great sound on orchestras is easy in Paris, you just have to know
> how to use it. I also did a live project recently where I dragged out
> the Paris rig and recorded live to 24-track and it sounds fabulous.
> I did the drums with 4 mics, one on the snare, one in the kick, and
> stereo overheads. So far, I am mixing it clean, and it sounds just
> sweet and pristine. No fake "warmth" no analog fuzziness, no
> middines, just great sound. I'll send you one when we are done if
> you like.
>

> DC
>
> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> Hey DC - have you qualified what you didn't like, or didn't work with Nuendo
>> for classical? I'm curious from a technical perspective, regardless of
>> preferences, and not to spark further debate over which is "best". I have
>> found noticeable differences in how Samplitude handles gain vs. Nuendo,
>> although at unity gain, they sum identically. Thanks!
>>
>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 4/14/06 5:48 PM, in article 444034e7\$1 @linux, "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> "Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> Anyway, I agree with most of the comments about Paris and it's sound
> but
>>>> when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left so desire.
>>> It
>>>> nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT,
>>>> Soundscape,
>>>> Nuendo, Samplitude etc.
>>>
>>>
>>> Then you don't know how to use Paris, and I have the tracks to prove it.
>>>
>>> Samplitude is competitive with Paris on orchestras, Nuendo is not.
>>>
>>>
>>> DC
>>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 03:58:27 GMT

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

Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>Lynn Fuston
>is one of the few to attempt that with DAWs on a large scale. You might
be
>surprised at how many unity gain mixes I found to cancel completely (all

>24-bits). Samplitude, Nuendo, and PTHD I believe (Paris didn't cancel with >anything that I recall).

Funny how those tests don't settle the issue. You can sum to zero, yet you write a CD and the sound changes. Why? No one knows. I mean no one. Not Lynn, Not Mel Lambert, not Bruce Jackson, not SSC, not no one. SSC actually gave me grief for talking about CD-R media then turned around and said not to write CD's over 4X. Ummm bit is bits right? BS. My Yamaha CD writer has a function called Advanced Audio Master Quality Recording. It lengthens the burns a bit and tests your media to get the laser levels just right. (It also reduces your max CD time to 68 minutes) And it sounds better. Noticeably. How would you measure it? Well I'm sure it has to do with the playback error correction, but we can't test it yet.

We can hear better than we can measure. As a matter of fact it is the acute hearing of real audio engineers and conductors that spurs the techies on to ever-more sophisticated tests. And all of us have heard really technical people do totally crap audio work. I have personally seen genius acousticians design total POS sound systems using every prediction and mapping tool and app in the world. As retarded as it is to insist that we can hear something that we can't hear when in a double-blind test, it is even more retarded to insist that something is not there because some test didn't show it. Sooner or later a test finds the anomaly and all the techies stop smirking and go back to playing with hard drives and the the audio engineers get some work done.

>From what I've heard even on the Nuendo forum, the show demos seem to be >plagued with badness.

That's because the company is run by idiots. Ever try calling them? And what kind of a loser outfit allows their AES and NAMM show demos to sound like crap? Even Sonic Solutions had the good sense to steal one of SSC's Paris demos to use in their booth. (true story! they got caught btw, and got reamed out by a longhair motorcycle crazy we know of...)

Listen, I believe you when you say it is better than the demos and I am glad to hear it, but there will be no Nuendo here as long as the company has their heads you know where. It ain't HARD to put out good demos.

>I wouldn't judge Nuendo or any product's sound quality on a noisy tradeshow
>floor.

I'm going to disagree completely with you here. You can't get the nuances, but if something is rocking-good you will hear it, and if it is crap you will hear that too. Nuendo has driven me out of the booth every time.

>Nuendo can deliver just as easily as any other DAW from my
>experience - it's all in how you use it, as with any other. At the same
>time I have no interest in convincing you otherwise on your opinion of it

Actually I believe you. I just would never use the product and do not believe it can beat a seasoned Paris jockey on the same orchestra. Let's do it ourselves sometime and see if we can settle it. You are not near SoCal are you?

>Sure, I would be very interested to hear the live project.

It should be out in a month or so.

best,

DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Jesse Skeens](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 04:58:07 GMT

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

"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:

>

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

>

>>Lynn Fuston

>>is one of the few to attempt that with DAWs on a large scale. You might
>be

>>surprised at how many unity gain mixes I found to cancel completely (all
>>24-bits). Samplitude, Nuendo, and PTHD I believe (Paris didn't cancel
with

>>anything that I recall).

>

>Funny how those tests don't settle the issue. You can sum to
>zero, yet you write a CD and the sound changes. Why? No one

>knows. I mean no one. Not Lynn, Not Mel Lambert, not Bruce
>Jackson, not SSC, not no one. SSC actually gave me grief for talking
>about CD-R media then turned around and said not to write CD's
>over 4X. Ummm bit is bits right? BS. My Yamaha CD writer
>has a function called Advanced Audio Master Quality Recording.
>It lengthens the burns a bit and tests your media to get the laser
>levels just right. (It also reduces your max CD time to 68 minutes)
>And it sounds better. Noticeably. How would you measure it?
>Well I'm sure it has to do with the playback error correction, but
>we can't test it yet.
>
>We can hear better than we can measure. As a matter of fact it i

But we can measure bits in digital audio just fine? I mean whats the mystery.
If all the sound is made up of its bit values and we should two files to
have the same values what possibly could make them sound different? There's
no other hidden value to account for that. We know this becuase we designed
the systems that record and playback the sound based on a fairly simple scheme.
Record audio as numbers and play those numbers back. IF the numbers match
then what could possibly make them not the same?

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Kim](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 05:25:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote:
>IF the numbers match
>then what could possibly make them not the same?

For starters, it might be worth doing some reading on Quantum Physics. Matter
isn't as it appears. It's largely probability fields more than actual solid
stuff as we think of it. I'm not going to get into this here, but that's
just one possibility that sprang to mind...

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 06:36:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quantization and math errors in the playback engine, for one. A to D
convertors is another.. I'm sure that there is more but those are the basics
that come to mind immediately for me. Plus, I think there is definitely
something to the *can't measure why they sound different, but do* theory.

AA

"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote in message news:44407d5f\$1@linux...

>

> "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:

>>

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

>>

>>>Lynn Fuston

>>>is one of the few to attempt that with DAWs on a large scale. You might

>>be

>>>surprised at how many unity gain mixes I found to cancel completely (all

>>>24-bits). Samplitude, Nuendo, and PTHD I believe (Paris didn't cancel

> with

>>>anything that I recall).

>>

>>Funny how those tests don't settle the issue. You can sum to

>>zero, yet you write a CD and the sound changes. Why? No one

>>knows. I mean no one. Not Lynn, Not Mel Lambert, not Bruce

>>Jackson, not SSC, not no one. SSC actually gave me grief for talking

>>about CD-R media then turned around and said not to write CD's

>>over 4X. Ummm bit is bits right? BS. My Yamaha CD writer

>>has a function called Advanced Audio Master Quality Recording.

>>It lengthens the burns a bit and tests your media to get the laser

>>levels just right. (It also reduces your max CD time to 68 minutes)

>>And it sounds better. Noticeably. How would you measure it?

>>Well I'm sure it has to do with the playback error correction, but

>>we can't test it yet.

>>

>>We can hear better than we can measure. As a matter of fact it i

>

> But we can measure bits in digital audio just fine? I mean whats the
> mystery.

> If all the sound is made up of its bit values and we should two files to

> have the same values what possibly could make them sound different?

> There's

> no other hidden value to account for that. We know this becuae we

> designed

> the systems that record and playback the sound based on a fairly simple

> scheme.

> Record audio as numbers and play those numbers back. IF the numbers match

> then what could possibly make them not the same?

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?

<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 06:39:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 4/14/06 9:58 PM, in article 44406f63\$1@linux, "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:

>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>
>> Lynn Fuston
>> is one of the few to attempt that with DAWs on a large scale. You might
> be
>> surprised at how many unity gain mixes I found to cancel completely (all
>> 24-bits). Samplitude, Nuendo, and PTHD I believe (Paris didn't cancel with
>> anything that I recall).
>
> Funny how those tests don't settle the issue. You can sum to
> zero, yet you write a CD and the sound changes. Why? No one
> knows. I mean no one. Not Lynn, Not Mel Lambert, not Bruce
> Jackson, not SSC, not no one. SSC actually gave me grief for talking
> about CD-R media then turned around and said not to write CD's
> over 4X. Ummm bit is bits right? BS. My Yamaha CD writer
> has a function called Advanced Audio Master Quality Recording.
> It lengthens the burns a bit and tests your media to get the laser
> levels just right. (It also reduces your max CD time to 68 minutes)
> And it sounds better. Noticeably. How would you measure it?
> Well I'm sure it has to do with the playback error correction, but
> we can't test it yet.
>

Obviously either Yamaha figured some part of it out or Advanced Audio Master Quality is euphemism for "sucker". ;-) You know I'm just making light of a debate that has been raging for as long as 1's and 0's have been around, not discounting what you are saying about the audible differences you hear. Developers don't just guess at techniques to improve quality. There is a science and technical reasoning behind it (usually, unless marketing holds all the marbles) - but that's why they do what they do, and I don't. I used to, but it drove me batty (hardware/software dev - too tedious for me).

If there is a way to generate a result, there is a way to test it, because that's the way someone found it to begin with - testing, trying and guessing. The fact is, a 1 is a 1 and a 0 is a 0, but the problem comes in how strings of them are interpreted into sound waves, and all the variables in between, and so the likelihood of simplified testing at the user level flies out the window.

> We can hear better than we can measure. As a matter of fact it is
> the acute hearing of real audio engineers and conductors that spurs

> the techies on to ever-more sophisticated tests. And all of us have
> heard really technical people do totally crap audio work. I have
> personally seen genius acousticians design total POS sound
> systems using every prediction and mapping tool and app in the
> world. As retarded as it is to insist that we can hear something
> that we can't hear when in a double-blind test, it is even more
> retarded to insist that something is not there because some test
> didn't show it.

And also it is often the expectation of the test that leads us to results that aren't there. The brain is a tricky interpreter, and that is why I there there is usually a way to ferret out the anomaly and give repeatability and solidity to what we perceive, or don't perceive.

> Sooner or later a test finds the anomaly and all
> the techies stop smirking and go back to playing with hard drives
> and the the audio engineers get some work done.
>
> :-))
>
> Listen, I believe you when you say it is better than the demos and I
> am glad to hear it, but there will be no Nuendo here as long as the
> company has their heads you know where. It ain't HARD to put out
> good demos.
>

You aren't the first to express displeasure with Steinberg, and I completely agree about demos - I could have given them a demo that killed anything I've heard them put out, as could a million other people, but maybe demo makers just don't get paid enough to do it right. I have clients with the same mentality - put all your eggs in one basket that might look good on paper and leave nothing left to hatch and grow the chickens with.

Some companies seem to take a developers' mindset to marketing ("It's great code, surely everyone can see that!"...well, no, not without Code Warrior and a CS degree...). I can think of another well known to this group that did the same.

>
>
>> I wouldn't judge Nuendo or any product's sound quality on a noisy tradeshow
>> floor.
>
> I'm going to disagree completely with you here. You can't get the
> nuances, but if something is rocking-good you will hear it, and if
> it is crap you will hear that too. Nuendo has driven me out of the
> booth every time.
>

Actually I was referring to the subtleties of summing and audio quality, which I assumed you were referring to when saying Nuendo couldn't cut it for recording classical. I presumed you had put them side by side and found one to be missing X where the other was wider at Z. To detect that level of detail obviously requires a quiet studio environment. Now, whether the material rocks or sucks is another matter entirely, and no doubt should be the first consideration for booth reps.

>
>> Nuendo can deliver just as easily as any other DAW from my
>> experience - it's all in how you use it, as with any other. At the same
>> time I have no interest in convincing you otherwise on your opinion of it
>> because it really doesn't matter to either one of us
>
>
> Actually I believe you. I just would never use the product and do
> not believe it can beat a seasoned Paris jockey on the same
> orchestra. Let's do it ourselves sometime and see if we can settle
> it. You are not near SoCal are you?

Colorado, so I'm on the same side of the Mississippi. A bit of a hike, but maybe sometime we can put these tools to a test for a musical purpose beyond just comparing bits and bytes.

>
>
>> Sure, I would be very interested to hear the live project.
>
> It should be out in a month or so.
>
> best,
>
> DC
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 07:03:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote:

>But we can measure bits in digital audio just fine? I mean whats the mystery.
> If all the sound is made up of its bit values and we should two files to
>have the same values what possibly could make them sound different?

Ever seen the code for a word processor, let alone a DAW?

Oh yeah, that's simple...

So you do a cancel at one point in the process and then tell yourself something you can hear is not real?

We hear better than we can measure. That may change someday but it ain't here yet.

>There's

>no other hidden value to account for that. We know this because we designed
>the systems that record and playback the sound based on a fairly simple
scheme.

> Record audio as numbers and play those numbers back. IF the numbers match
>then what could possibly make them not the same?

Now what happens when something IS different? If you can't answer the above question do you convince yourself that you are hearing things? ARE you hearing things?

How you answer those questions will determine if you are an audio engineer or an IT guy.

DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Music Lab Sweden](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 07:03:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow, this is a truly heated discussion. I sense it triggers all kinds of emotions.

Well, DC almighty. It seems like it is difficult to argue with you since you have the best ears on the planet and that your opinion is some kind of

operator which gives you the power to simply tell a fellow Paris user that

than yourself.

Please direct us to some tracks to prove your superiority as a Paris operator and sound engineer. I need not to say that the comparisons should be on a scientific level and not some bullshit "feeling" or "it sounded better yesterday with Paris" comparison.

"DC" <dc@spanthemoon.com> wrote:

>

>"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>
>

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

>It

>>nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT, Soundscape,
>>Nuendo, Samplitude etc.

>
>

>Then you don't know how to use Paris, and I have the tracks to prove it.

>

>Samplitude is competitive with Paris on orchestras, Nuendo is not.

>
>

>DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 07:30:42 GMT

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

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

Absolutely, but it does not follow therefore that all of this is both known and quantifiable. It's not. Look at the tremendous variables in phase shift and group delay in various eq's, both analog and digital! But wait, it's just 1 & 0's right?

>If there is a way to generate a result, there is a way to test it, because
>that's the way someone found it to begin with - testing, trying and
>guessing. The fact is, a 1 is a 1 and a 0 is a 0, but the problem comes
>in
>how strings of them are interpreted into sound waves, and all the variables
>in between, and so the likelihood of simplified testing at the user level
>flies out the window.

Genius. Here's your degree. I wish I had said that.

So, why doesn't
anyone know why the sound changes when you write it to CD?
Of course, different D-A and all, but it is different even when you
pop the CD player into your D-A for your DAW!

There is more to be learned. period.

>And also it is often the expectation of the test that leads us to results
>that aren't there. The brain is a tricky interpreter, and that is why I
>there there is usually a way to ferret out the anomaly and give
>repeatability and solidity to what we perceive, or don't perceive.

Yep it is called double-blind testing and one pound of it is worth
a ton of circular reasoning about 1's and 0's.

>Actually I was referring to the subtleties of summing and audio quality,
>which I assumed you were referring to when saying Nuendo couldn't cut it
for
>recording classical. I presumed you had put them side by side and found
one
>to be missing X where the other was wider at Z. To detect that level of
>detail obviously requires a quiet studio environment. Now, whether the
>material rocks or sucks is another matter entirely, and no doubt should
be
>the first consideration for booth reps.

Well I've never gotten that far because the company is run by
people who are not interested in me as a client. I suspect that
explains why so few classical people use it, even if it is as good
as the others. I refuse to reject the evidence at hand that these
people do not care about audio quality and treat customers who
call them like dirt. Now, you call up Sequoia and spend 2 hours
sitting down with a product that sounds wonderful and works
great, and they give you their cellphone numbers, and it gets hard
to find the diamond in the mudpile over at Steinberg.

People who do classical are real serious about their work. Funky and
warm with a good groove means nothing. It is way
different from pop because you literally cannot overkill the sound
quality. Listen to the better Telarc or Dorian stuff. A good guy
can do better work with careful mic placement, a great convertor
and just the right EQ in post, all at 44.1, than a lesser guy can
do at 192, no matter the gear, yet so many people think you can
determine quality from specs and numbers... yikes!

>Colorado, so I'm on the same side of the Mississippi. A bit of a hike,
but
>maybe sometime we can put these tools to a test for a musical purpose beyond

>just comparing bits and bytes.

That would be fun. I want come through this summer and see DJ as well.

take care

DC

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

Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 07:37:57 GMT

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

"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>Well, DC almighty. It seems like it is difficult to argue with you since
>you have the best ears on the planet and that your opinion is some kind
of
>physical absolute.

This is so silly and childish. I will not respond, thanks!

>I need not to say that the comparisons should be on a
>scientific level and not some bullshit "feeling" or "it sounded better yesterday
>with Paris" comparison.

And there you have exposed yourself. Oh yeah. "science" as in
your opinion? Yeah "science" like that which produced the music?

Nah, it's art and if you can't hear the difference, then you are in the
wrong business.

Say, do they still let you have mothers over there?

If you are so humble, try contributing something to this group
besides trolling and baiting, ok Buhu??

DC

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

Posted by [Music Lab Sweden](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 07:55:43 GMT

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

were non-disputable. It is YOU who put that angle to the discussion. Please
any of the anomalies I mentioned. Miraculously you never encountered them???

Nuendo, which you mention as inferior...

BTW. What I meant by scientific was simply a proper A-B comparison with all
other things being equal with perfect level matching in the same enviroment
with the same tracks.

There are more things to the sound than just playing back raw tracks. For
example, the possibility to properly route drums to a seperate bus and process
them affects sound. I know it can be done in Paris, but how long does it
take and how easy is it compared to other systems?

"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:

>

>"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>

>>Well, DC almighty. It seems like it is difficult to argue with you since
>>you have the best ears on the planet and that your opinion is some kind
>of

>>physical absolute.

>

>This is so silly and childish. I will not respond, thanks!

>

>>I need not to say that the comparisons should be on a
>>scientific level and not some bullshit "feeling" or "it sounded better
yesterday

>>with Paris" comparison.

>

>And there you have exposed yourself. Oh yeah. "science" as in
>your opinion? Yeah "science" like that which produced the music?

>

>Nah, it's art and if you can't hear the difference, then you are in the
>wrong business.

>

>

>

>Say, do they still let you have mothers over there?

>

>If you are so humble, try contributing something to this group
>besides trolling and baiting, ok Buhu??

>

>DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [wmarkwilson](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 09:18:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Observation if I may; your words are a dead give away that the "heat" and the "triggers" are yours bro.... you've been in the bathroom too long.

Regards,
W. Mark Wilson

"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote in message [news:44409acb\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:44409acb$1@linux...)

>
> Wow, this is a truly heated discussion. I sense it triggers all kinds of
> emotions.
>
> Well, DC almighty. It seems like it is difficult to argue with you since
> you have the best ears on the planet and that your opinion is some kind of

> Paris
> operator which gives you the power to simply tell a fellow Paris user that

> longer
> than yourself.

>
> Please direct us to some tracks to prove your superiority as a Paris
> operator
> and sound engineer. I need not to say that the comparisons should be on a
> scientific level and not some bullshit "feeling" or "it sounded better
> yesterday
> with Paris" comparison.

>

>
> "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:

>>
>> "Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>>
>>

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

>>It

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

>>>Soundscape,

>>>Nuendo, Samplitude etc.

>>

>>

>>Then you don't know how to use Paris, and I have the tracks to prove it.

>>

>>Samplitude is competitive with Paris on orchestras, Nuendo is not.

>>
>>
>>DC
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Ed](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 10:42:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well I disagree... Babu gave his opinion.. and I read it. Perhaps we agree with him on some things... whatever, it didn't call for a reply saying "You don't know how to use it... I can prove it" and turn around and run with your fuckin tail up your ass.... PUSSY! DO NOT respond if you you can't back it... I am Paris owner for many years... but Paris, especially 3.0 has so many flaws... it pathetic... Accept the truth... EMU trashed it, ID pretty much trashed it too... It is a DEAD daw... but I am going to use it as long as it works for me and until I can afford to acquire something better.

I use to come on this newsgroup and we kept out the blabber bullshit I see all over this place. We use to talk strictly Paris and recording and components and products.. now all I read about is a person personal crap that is unwanted by most... as I did before, I'll prolly quit coming here again.. too much bullshit. adios...

"W. Mark Wilson" <wmarkwilson@integrity.com> wrote in message news:4440b9ba@linux...

> Observation if I may; your words are a dead give away that the "heat" and
> the "triggers" are yours bro.... you've been in the bathroom too long.

>
> Regards,
> W. Mark Wilson

>
> "Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote in message [news:44409acb\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:44409acb$1@linux...)

>>
>> Wow, this is a truly heated discussion. I sense it triggers all kinds of
>> emotions.

>>
>> Well, DC almighty. It seems like it is difficult to argue with you since
>> you have the best ears on the planet and that your opinion is some kind
of

>> Paris
>> operator which gives you the power to simply tell a fellow Paris user
that

>> longer

> > than yourself.
> >
> > Please direct us to some tracks to prove your superiority as a Paris
> > operator
> > and sound engineer. I need not to say that the comparisons should be on
a
> > scientific level and not some bullshit "feeling" or "it sounded better
> > yesterday
> > with Paris" comparison.
> >

> >
> > "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:
> >>
> >>

but
> >>>when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left so desire.
> >>It
> >>>nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT,
> >>>Soundscape,
> >>>Nuendo, Samplitude etc.
> >>
> >>
> >>Then you don't know how to use Paris, and I have the tracks to prove it.
> >>
> >>Samplitude is competitive with Paris on orchestras, Nuendo is not.
> >>
> >>
> >>DC
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 11:38:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Ed

Don't sweat it...it's been pretty cordial around here lately...you just
picked a bad time to check the NG out again

Stick around, there's been some pretty informative cross platform, digital
interface and work around discussions going on lately...oh and a few more

people bailing on Paris but that's to be expected.

Don

"Ed" <askme@email.com> wrote in message news:4440cd0d@linux...
> Well I disagree... Babu gave his opinion.. and I read it. Perhaps we
> agree
> with him on some things... whatever, it didn't call for a reply saying
> "You
> don't know how to use it... I can prove it" and turn around and run with
> your fuckin tail up your ass.... PUSSY! DO NOT respond if you you can't
> back it... I am Paris owner for many years... but Paris, especially 3.0
> has
> so many flaws... it pathetic... Accept the truth... EMU trashed it, ID
> pretty much trashed it too... It is a DEAD daw... but I am going to use
> it
> as long as it works for me and until I can afford to acquire something
> better.
>
> I use to come on this newsgroup and we kept out the blabber bullshit I see
> all over this place. We use to talk strictly Paris and recording and
> components and products.. now all I read about is a person personal crap
> that is unwanted by most... as I did before, I'll prolly quit coming here
> again.. too much bullshit. adios...
>
> "W. Mark Wilson" <wmarkwilson@integrity.com> wrote in message
> news:4440b9ba@linux...
>> Observation if I may; your words are a dead give away that the "heat" and
>> the "triggers" are yours bro.... you've been in the bathroom too long.
>>
>> Regards,
>> W. Mark Wilson
>>
>> "Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote in message news:44409acb\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Wow, this is a truly heated discussion. I sense it triggers all kinds
>>> of
>>> emotions.
>>>
>>> Well, DC almighty. It seems like it is difficult to argue with you
>>> since
>>> you have the best ears on the planet and that your opinion is some kind
> of

>>> Paris
>>> operator which gives you the power to simply tell a fellow Paris user
> that

>> > longer
>> > than yourself.
>> >
>> > Please direct us to some tracks to prove your superiority as a Paris
>> > operator
>> > and sound engineer. I need not to say that the comparisons should be on
> a
>> > scientific level and not some bullshit "feeling" or "it sounded better
>> > yesterday
>> > with Paris" comparison.
>> >

>> >
>> > "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> "Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:
>> >>
>> >>

> but
>> >>>when it comes to classical music, Paris simply has much left so
>> >>>desire.
>> >>It
>> >>>nowhere as clean and accurate as the newer modern systems, be it PT,
>> >>>Soundscape,
>> >>>Nuendo, Samplitude etc.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>Then you don't know how to use Paris, and I have the tracks to prove
>> >>>it.
>> >>
>> >>>Samplitude is competitive with Paris on orchestras, Nuendo is not.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>DC
>> >
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [DC](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 17:27:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>

>Who is trolling?

Oh, now you are all reasonable and "I was only doing this" and blah blah...

You were trolling. Now you want to have a debate? Tell you what, why don't you actually contribute to this group for a while? Share your favorite mics and pres. How about some tricks getting a great bass sound? What do you use for choirs?

Then I will be happy to share with you all the details. But when you come one here with a "reality check" and then accuse ME of a lack of humility, you are nothing but a troll.

>were non-disputable. It is YOU who put that angle to the discussion.

EVERYONES experiences are disputable.

>Nuendo, which you mention as inferior...

Brian doesn't do symphonic music, he does pop and works at a modern church. I'll bet he still runs Paris at one place or another. None of us cares who leaves and who stays. I have clients coming here this morning who think Paris sounds fabulous. Now show me where your opinion should count in the whole equation?

>BTW. What I meant by scientific was simply a proper A-B comparison with all

>other things being equal with perfect level matching in the same environment
>with the same tracks.

Well, Paris killed Sonic Solutions in that very test, and NO ONE claims that Nuendo sounds better than Sonic. My point was that if you believe there is a lack of clarity and detail in Paris compared to something else, than you are using it wrong. I stand by that point and have done the work to prove it. Now, if you want to add something to our little group instead of dumping on it, I will send you a CD, all the way to Sweden, to let you hear some of it.

>There are more things to the sound than just playing back raw tracks. For
>example, the possibility to properly route drums to a seperate bus and process
>them affects sound. I know it can be done in Paris, but how long does it
>take and how easy is it compared to other systems?

Don't need this for what I do. Glad it works for you.

If you wish us to act collegial, then act like a colleague.

best,

DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Jesse Skeens](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 20:32:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spanthemoon.com> wrote:

>
>"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>>But we can measure bits in digital audio just fine? I mean whats the mystery.
>> If all the sound is made up of its bit values and we should two files
to
>>have the same values what possibly could make them sound different?
>
>
>Ever seen the code for a word processor, let alone a DAW?
>
>Oh yeah, that's simple...
>
>So you do a cancel at one point in the process and then tell
>yourself something you can hear is not real?
>
>We hear better than we can measure. That may change someday
>but it ain't here yet.

The complexity of code in a DAW has no bearing on the fact that an audio file is just 1's and 0's. At the level that a DAW reads those values two files with the same set of values should read exactly the same by the DAW, theres no way for it to see a difference.

>>There's

>>no other hidden value to account for that. We know this because we designed
>>the systems that record and playback the sound based on a fairly simple
>scheme.
>> Record audio as numbers and play those numbers back. IF the numbers match
>>then what could possibly make them not the same?
>
>
>Now what happens when something IS different? If you can't
>answer the above question do you convince yourself that you are
>hearing things? ARE you hearing things?
>
>How you answer those questions will determine if you are an audio
>engineer or an IT guy.

So I have to be either or? If you hear something different then your mind is probably fooling you. There's many variables at play, you'd have to examine each case individually. It's hard to just sit here and making sweeping statements without looking at the details.

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 01:36:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote:

>The complexity of code in a DAW has no bearing on the fact that an audio
>file is just 1's and 0's.

WHAT? it has every bearing on what is done to them, and that changes dramatically according to that very-complex code.

>At the level that a DAW reads those values two
>files with the same set of values should read exactly the same by the DAW,
>there's no way for it to see a difference.

That's assuming a lot.

>So I have to be either or? If you hear something different then your mind
>is probably fooling you.

And there it is. As silly as some of the "golden ears" are, you guys are much, much worse. You reason backwards from your

assumptions and convince yourself that something you hear is not there. Then one day your assumptions are shown to be invalid.

>Theres many variables at play, you'd have to examime
>each case induvidually. It's hard to just sit here and making sweeping
statements
>without looking at the details.

Thank you. And a decent percentage of people who hear things that you cannot measure are what drives forward progress. Remember the sound of the early Sony 1630/1640 decks? The techies all said the same thing you are saying. It's fine, it's just 1' and 0's and your mind is fooling you.

BS

best,

DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 02:26:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think it's just plain old magic.

;o)

"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote in message news:44419fa8\$1@linux...

>

> "Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>

> >The complexity of code in a DAW has no bearing on the fact that an audio

> >file is just 1's and 0's.

>

>

> WHAT? it has every bearing on what is done to them, and that

> changes dramatically according to that very-complex code.

>

>

> >At the level that a DAW reads those values two

> >files with the same set of values should read exactly the same by the
DAW,

> >theres no way for it to see a difference.

>

> That's assuming a lot.
>
>
> >So I have to be either or? If you hear something different then your
mind
> >is probably fooling you.
>
> And there it is. As silly as some of the "golden ears" are, you guys
> are much, much worse. You reason backwards from your
> assumptions and convince yourself that something you hear is not
> there. Then one day your assumptions are shown to be invalid.
>
>
> >Theres many variables at play, you'd have to examime
> >each case individually. It's hard to just sit here and making sweeping
> statements
> >without looking at the details.
>
> Thank you. And a decent percentage of people who hear things that
> you cannot measure are what drives forward progress. Remember
> the sound of the early Sony 1630/1640 decks? The techies all
> said the same thing you are saying. It's fine, it's just 1' and 0's and
> your mind is fooling you.
>
> BS
>
> best,
>
> DC
>

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 03:24:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I was reviewing a mix the other day with RME's Digicheck bit analyzer and found 3 twos, 4 fives and 1 eleven. I flipped them over and the mix sounded a lot wider. Garage band....what are ya gonna do.

On 4/15/06 8:26 PM, in article 4441ae26@linux, "DJ"
<animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

> I think it's just plain old magic.
>
> ;o)
>
> "DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote in message news:44419fa8\$1@linux...

>>
>> "Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> The complexity of code in a DAW has no bearing on the fact that an audio
>>> file is just 1's and 0's.
>>
>>
>> WHAT? it has every bearing on what is done to them, and that
>> changes dramatically according to that very-complex code.
>>
>>
>>> At the level that a DAW reads those values two
>>> files with the same set of values should read exactly the same by the
> DAW,
>>> theres no way for it to see a difference.
>>
>> That's assuming a lot.
>>
>>
>>> So I have to be either or? If you hear something different then your
> mind
>>> is probably fooling you.
>>
>> And there it is. As silly as some of the "golden ears" are, you guys
>> are much, much worse. You reason backwards from your
>> assumptions and convince yourself that something you hear is not
>> there. Then one day your assumptions are shown to be invalid.
>>
>>
>>> Theres many variables at play, you'd have to examime
>>> each case induvidually. It's hard to just sit here and making sweeping
>> statements
>>> without looking at the details.
>>
>> Thank you. And a decent percentage of people who hear things that
>> you cannot measure are what drives forward progress. Remember
>> the sound of the early Sony 1630/1640 decks? The techies all
>> said the same thing you are saying. It's fine, it's just 1' and 0's and
>> your mind is fooling you.
>>
>> BS
>>
>> best,
>>
>> DC
>>
>

>

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

Posted by [Music Lab Sweden](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 07:12:56 GMT

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

"DC" <dc@spamthesweddes.com> wrote:

>

>"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>>

>>Who is trolling?

>

>Oh, now you are all reasonable and "I was only doing this" and

>blah blah...

>

>You were trolling. Now you want to have a debate? Tell you what,

>why don't you actually contribute to this group for a while?

>Share your favorite mics and pres. How about some tricks getting

>a great bass sound? What do you use for choirs?

their opinion.

>

>Then I will be happy to share with you all the details. But when you

>come one here with a "reality check" and then accuse ME of a

>lack of humility, you are nothing but a troll.

as you do???

>

>>were non-disputable. It is YOU who put that angle to the discussion.

>

>EVERYONES experiences are disputable.

Yeah, you really left a lot of room for that in the sentence below:

>"Then you don't know how to use Paris, and I have the tracks to >prove it."

>

>

>>Nuendo, which you mention as inferior...

>

>

>Brian doesn't do symphonic music, he does pop and works at

>a modern church. I'll bet he still runs Paris at one place or another.

Huh, your bet? If you read my post you would see that I also record pop, rock etc. and that I actually praised Paris in these applications.

>None of us cares who leaves and who stays. I have clients coming
>here this morning who think Paris sounds fabulous. Now show me
>where your opinion should count in the whole equation?

Thats why you were all over the poor guy, Dave who switched to PT and praised his new system?

>

>

>>BTW. What I meant by scientific was simply a proper A-B comparison with
>all

>>other things being equal with perfect level matching in the same enviroment
>>with the same tracks.

>

>Well, Paris killed Sonic Solutions in that very test, and NO ONE
>claims that Nuendo sounds better than Sonic. My point was that
>if you believe there is a lack of clarity and detail in Paris compared
>to something else, than you are using it wrong. I stand by that point
>and have done the work to prove it. Now, if you want to add
>something to our little group instead of dumping on it, I will send
>you a CD, all the way to Sweden, to let you hear some of it.

>

>

>>There are more things to the sound than just playing back raw tracks. For
>>example, the possibility to properly route drums to a seperate bus and
process

>>them affects sound. I know it can be done in Paris, but how long does it
>>take and how easy is it compared to other systems?

>

>

>Don't need this for what I do. Glad it works for you.

>

>

>If you wish us to act collegial, then act like a colleague.

>

>best,

>
>DC

This will be my last post on this topic. Waste of time...

Paris!!!???

Regards
Babu

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Music Lab Sweden](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 07:46:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spamtheswedese.com> wrote:

>
>why don't you actually contribute to this group for a while?
>Share your favorite mics and pres. How about some tricks getting
>a great bass sound? What do you use for choirs?

>
BTW. If you really are interested, I usually use one of the following setups
for recording choirs. All depending on time available for preparation etc.

Recording medium: SS32 with 896 I/O or RME Fireface800 and a laptop.

MicPre: Millenia Media HV3

X-Y or a Royer SF12 ribbon.

do very slight limiting/compression with a Crane Song STC8.

Regards

Babu

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 16:47:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>BTW. If you really are interested, I usually use one of the following setups

>for recording choirs. All depending on time available for preparation etc.

Of course I am interested.

>Recording medium: SS32 with 896 I/O or RME Fireface800 and a laptop.

>

>MicPre: Millenia Media HV3

I put one of the HV3's in for an orchestra with B&K 4003 mics. Nice mic pre indeed.

>X-Y or a Royer SF12 ribbon.

How is the Royer? Not too warm? I used spaced omni's most of the time and told the people who care about mono to pan one channel center and mute the other.

>do very slight limiting/compression with a Crane Song STC8.

Wavelab is one thing I really wish we could get for macs.

Sounds like a nice setup.

best, DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 16:51:28 GMT

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

"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>Paris!!!???

Of course not. But calling your opinions a "reality check" is perhaps partly to blame here, don't you think?

best,

DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Music Lab Sweden](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 18:09:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:

>
>"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:
>

>>Paris!!!???

>
>
>Of course not. But calling your opinions a "reality check" is perhaps
>partly to blame here, don't you think?

>
>
>best,
>
>DC

Regards
Babu

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [Music Lab Sweden](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 18:45:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spamthemoon.com> wrote:

>
>"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:
>
>>BTW. If you really are interested, I usually use one of the following setups
>>for recording choirs. All depending on time available for preparation etc.
>
>Of course I am interested.
>
>>Recording medium: SS32 with 896 I/O or RME Fireface800 and a laptop.
>>
>>MicPre: Millenia Media HV3
>
>I put one of the HV3's in for an orchestra with B&K 4003 mics. Nice
>mic pre indeed.

for API for pop/rock though. Lots of clean gain for quite passages. Wonderful

for strings, ac guitars as well.

>
>

>>X-Y or a Royer SF12 ribbon.

>

>How is the Royer? Not too warm? I used spaced omni's most

>of the time and told the people who care about mono to pan

>one channel center and mute the other.

Spaced omnis should be the most accurate with less phase issues, but they

to have a pair of omnis as well.

The Royers are wonderful on certain material, but you need A LOT of clean gain to record choirs. I usually put it on a very high boom quite near the

choirs. However, the uncolored mids and the incredibly smooth highs are very hard to achieve with conventional condensers.

>
>

>>do very slight limiting/compression with a Crane Song STC8.

>

>Wavelab is one thing I really wish we could get for macs.

>

>Sounds like a nice setup.

>

>best, DC

>

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

Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 20:06:29 GMT

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

"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

And from mine as well.

Best wishes

DC

Subject: Re: My evolving position on the Paris sound vs. PT.-Ear CHECK
Posted by [dc\[4\]](#) on Sun, 16 Apr 2006 20:23:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Babu" <musiclab@lund.bonet.se> wrote:

>for API for pop/rock though. Lots of clean gain for quite passages. Wonderful
>for strings, ac guitars as well.

Absolutely and great folks at the company with comprehensive support.

I use a modded Jensen 990 Twin Servo that I just love. Detail to die for and as smooth as can be. Another place I like clean pres in pop is on drum overheads and pianos. I also have had great luck when a singer has a big voice, with the 990 and a good condensor mic. Otherwise, I like my Summit Tube mic pre for pop.

>Spaced omnis should be the most accurate with less phase issues, but they

Oh absolutely. Most of my work was done in nice concert halls so the clarity off-axis was a big plus. It also allowed me to get really close to the orchestra without getting too dry. Often I would be right over the conductor's head about 18 feet up (5.5m) and I always used the nosecones on the B&K's. I did a classical harp disc in a cathedral with spaced omni's about 4 feet (1.2m) from the strings. I took the harp's padded bag, and anything else I could find and put them on the floor around the harp to cut down on the reflection from the floor. I like the results.

You can compensate for omni's if you don't like the room by getting close, but they don't work everywhere. This is why we need so many mics! (this is what I tell my wife at least)

>I would love
>to have a pair of omnis as well.

Can't beat the Danes on this! (B&K) Not inexpensive of course and do get the nosecones.

>The Royers are wonderful on certain material, but you need A LOT of clean
>gain to record choirs. I usually put it on a very high boom quite near the

>choirs. However, the uncolored mids and the incredibly smooth highs are very
>hard to achieve with conventional condensers.

I think choirs, recorded well, are just glorious. One of my favorite discs is Lauridsen's Lux Aeterna by the Los Angeles Master Chorale. The music is so radiant I would have recorded it for free. (shhhh don't tell anyone...) The guys who did it are very good.

<http://www.lamc.org/tickets/recordings.html>

DC
