Subject: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by mikep[1] on Fri, 20 Jul 2007 20:11:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans PT)
and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?

Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by LaMont on Fri, 20 Jul 2007 20:42:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I love Nuendo/Cubase SX 's work flow and editing. They make you want to work
AND makes the recording process enjoyable.

LaMont

"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>
>I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
PT)
>and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>
>Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by TCB on Fri, 20 Jul 2007 20:54:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

My music means I _have_ to have good MIDI and VSTis. I got tired of slaving
machines to each other, found it made both the creative and work parts of
music less fun and more time consuming.

TCB

"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>
>I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans

PT)
>and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>
>Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by mikep[1] on Fri, 20 Jul 2007 20:54:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's interesting. I had just the opposite opinion, for mixing at least.
I keep looking for the aux sends and a bigger overview of the EQ. Do you
tend to use plug-in eq more than the track eq?

I guess I just love the analog look and workflow of the Paris mixer.

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>I love Nuendo/Cubase SX 's work flow and editing. They make you want to
work
>AND makes the recording process enjoyable.
>
>LaMont
>
>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>
>>I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>PT)
>>and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>>looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>
>>Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by mikep[1] on Fri, 20 Jul 2007 20:56:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That makes sense. If I were using VSTi's I would look for something else as

well.

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>
>My music means I _have_ to have good MIDI and VSTis. I got tired of slaving
>machines to each other, found it made both the creative and work parts of
>music less fun and more time consuming.
>
>TCB
>
>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>
>>I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>PT)
>>and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>>looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>
>>Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by EK Sound on Fri, 20 Jul 2007 20:59:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I got tired of her running off to.... oh, wait, wrong thread... ;-)

David.

Mikep wrote:
> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans PT)
> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>
> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by DJ on Fri, 20 Jul 2007 21:43:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"EK Sound" <askme@nospam.com> wrote in message news:46a1235f$1@linux...
>I got tired of her running off to.... oh, wait, wrong thread... ;-)
>
> David.
>

.....she was probably just looking to get some PDC.....you know
how they can be sometimes.....

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by John [1] on Fri, 20 Jul 2007 22:48:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Cubase rocks !

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Aaron Allen on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 00:09:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I haven't left it either, only augmented it. The reason I see will be midi,
virtual synths and higher sample rates. On the hardware side, when we can no
longer get compatible motherboards or expansion chassis and all my stock of
them dies, it's time to get native full bore.

AA

"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote in message
news:46a116f2$1@linux...
>
> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
> PT)
> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>
> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by John Macy on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 02:20:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
> I haven't left it either, only augmented it. The reason I see will be midi,

>virtual synths and higher sample rates. On the hardware side, when we can
no
>longer get compatible motherboards or expansion chassis and all my stock
of
>them dies, it's time to get native full bore.
>
>AA
>
>
>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote in message
>news:46a116f2$1@linux...
>>
>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans

>> PT)
>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>
>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by John Macy on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 02:21:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Who's leaving? :)

Still love it--use it everyday and make a good living with it...

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
> I haven't left it either, only augmented it. The reason I see will be midi,

>virtual synths and higher sample rates. On the hardware side, when we can
no
>longer get compatible motherboards or expansion chassis and all my stock
of
>them dies, it's time to get native full bore.
>
>AA

>
>
>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote in message
>news:46a116f2$1@linux...
>>
>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans

>> PT)
>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>
>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 02:51:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes.. Plugin eq first, bu for some small adjustments, i'll turn on a band
or 2

"Mikep" <Mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>
>That's interesting. I had just the opposite opinion, for mixing at least.
>I keep looking for the aux sends and a bigger overview of the EQ. Do you
>tend to use plug-in eq more than the track eq?
>
>I guess I just love the analog look and workflow of the Paris mixer.
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>I love Nuendo/Cubase SX 's work flow and editing. They make you want to
>work
>>AND makes the recording process enjoyable.
>>
>>LaMont
>>
>>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>>PT)
>>>and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>>>looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.

>>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>
>>>Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 02:54:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I should say that I have not left Paris, only that I use Nuendo to track and
edit and sometimes mix..

...
"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>I love Nuendo/Cubase SX 's work flow and editing. They make you want to
work
>AND makes the recording process enjoyable.
>
>LaMont
>
>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>
>>I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>PT)
>>and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>>looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>
>>Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Neil on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 03:58:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey John... are you using any native DAW software at all?
Either integrated with Paris on a separate PC, or as a stand-
alone app for certain projects? Just wondering.

Neil

"John Macy" <spamlessjohn@johnmacy.com> wrote:
>
>Who's leaving? :)
>
>Still love it--use it everyday and make a good living with it...
>
>
>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>> I haven't left it either, only augmented it. The reason I see will be
midi,
>
>>virtual synths and higher sample rates. On the hardware side, when we can
>no
>>longer get compatible motherboards or expansion chassis and all my stock
>of
>>them dies, it's time to get native full bore.
>>
>>AA
>>
>>
>>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote in message
>>news:46a116f2$1@linux...
>>>
>>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>
>>> PT)
>>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now,
but
>>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>
>>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Neil on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 04:18:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:

>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?

In my case:

a.) Higher sample rates & resolution.

b.) MIDI functionality.

c.) The ability to seamlessly integrate the bazillion
inexpensive and/or free VST plugins that are available out
there with no need for wrappers & hence features that may or
may not work.

Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by DJ on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 04:26:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

John has more outboard gear in his racks than Mercenary audio.

;o)

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a1846f$1@linux...
>
> Hey John... are you using any native DAW software at all?
> Either integrated with Paris on a separate PC, or as a stand-
> alone app for certain projects? Just wondering.
>
> Neil
>
>
> "John Macy" <spamlessjohn@johnmacy.com> wrote:
>>
>>Who's leaving? :)
>>
>>Still love it--use it everyday and make a good living with it...
>>
>>
>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>> I haven't left it either, only augmented it. The reason I see will be
> midi,
>>
>>>virtual synths and higher sample rates. On the hardware side, when we can
>>no
>>>longer get compatible motherboards or expansion chassis and all my stock

>>of
>>>them dies, it's time to get native full bore.
>>>
>>>AA
>>>
>>>
>>>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote in message
>>>news:46a116f2$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>>
>>>> PT)
>>>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now,
> but
>>>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>>
>>>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency
>>>> compensation.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Sarah on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 09:46:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Not trying to be a smartass here . . . genuinely curious . . . is the difference in those higher sample rates & resolution clearly audible? If you put us all in a room and did a blindfold test, how many of us would pass? I only ask because I'm not sure I would.

S

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a18916$1@linux...
>
> "Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>
>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>
> In my case:
>
> a.) Higher sample rates & resolution.

>
> b.) MIDI functionality.
>
> c.) The ability to seamlessly integrate the bazillion
> inexpensive and/or free VST plugins that are available out
> there with no need for wrappers & hence features that may or
> may not work.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by BradLyons on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 11:30:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I loved Paris for tracking and mixing, but it started to tick me off--numerous bugs, lockups, plugins not working properly, mixes bouncing differently than how I mixed them on larger projects, etc. I just couldn't deal with it anymore, fortunately at that time I was taking a break from doing studio work and left it behind. I then picked up a Nuendo rig for live recording, I liked it...but wasn't in-love with the workflow. Since then, I've put in a pair of ProToolsHD3 Accel systems with a Control24 and couldn't be happier.

Brad Lyons
www.audioandmidi.com

"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>
>I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
PT)
>and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>
>Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Kateeba on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 13:44:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Never left. Use it exclusively with Performer slaved to it to do seamless midi.

Won't even think of leaving till it all breaks down. :)

Lou

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Neil on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 15:04:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

All of you would hear a difference... except for Deej, who
would purposely pick the wrong one just to be difficult.

:D

Seriously, though - I believe you'd hear a difference... I can,
and I don't have super-human hearing... people who've recorded
with me can, vs. stuff they've done elsewhere, but then there
are so many variables in that kind of comparison it's really
not a scientific one at all (but then, music isn't all about
science, is it?). It's not so much about trying to get
a "higher" high-end, it's that you're allowing content that
occurs above the 22k Nyquist frequency (if recording at 44.1K)
to pass through, and being able to then perceive the lower-
order harmonics of those elements that DO occur below the final
22k/CD quality Nyquist frequency. It's not a dramatic
difference, but it's not so subtle that you can't hear
a difference... to me it sounds more natural, I guess. You're
hearing elements of stuff that exists in the real world that
you wouldn't be hearing if you never allowed them to be
recorded.

I guess the only way to really confirm this would be to record
a performance to two identical DAW rigs at the same time, with
one DAW set at 44.1k & one set at 88.2k or 96k or whatever,
then mix both identically, convert both down to CD-quality
16/44.1 & see if there's a perceiveable difference.

Neil

Neil

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>Not trying to be a smartass here . . . genuinely curious . . . is the
>difference in those higher sample rates & resolution clearly audible? If

>you put us all in a room and did a blindfold test, how many of us would

>pass? I only ask because I'm not sure I would.
>
>S
>
>
>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a18916$1@linux...
>>
>> "Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>
>>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>
>> In my case:
>>
>> a.) Higher sample rates & resolution.
>>
>> b.) MIDI functionality.
>>
>> c.) The ability to seamlessly integrate the bazillion
>> inexpensive and/or free VST plugins that are available out
>> there with no need for wrappers & hence features that may or
>> may not work.
>>
>> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by DJ on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 15:07:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

My thinking is that it would be best to find a way to bastardize a system
running at 88.2 so that it sounded just as good as one running at 44.1.

;o)

"Neil" <IOUIOU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a22066$1@linux...
>
> All of you would hear a difference... except for Deej, who
> would purposely pick the wrong one just to be difficult.
>
> :D
>
> Seriously, though - I believe you'd hear a difference... I can,
> and I don't have super-human hearing... people who've recorded

> with me can, vs. stuff they've done elsewhere, but then there
> are so many variables in that kind of comparison it's really
> not a scientific one at all (but then, music isn't all about
> science, is it?). It's not so much about trying to get
> a "higher" high-end, it's that you're allowing content that
> occurs above the 22k Nyquist frequency (if recording at 44.1K)
> to pass through, and being able to then perceive the lower-
> order harmonics of those elements that DO occur below the final
> 22k/CD quality Nyquist frequency. It's not a dramatic
> difference, but it's not so subtle that you can't hear
> a difference... to me it sounds more natural, I guess. You're
> hearing elements of stuff that exists in the real world that
> you wouldn't be hearing if you never allowed them to be
> recorded.
>
> I guess the only way to really confirm this would be to record
> a performance to two identical DAW rigs at the same time, with
> one DAW set at 44.1k & one set at 88.2k or 96k or whatever,
> then mix both identically, convert both down to CD-quality
> 16/44.1 & see if there's a perceiveable difference.
>
>
> Neil
>
>
>
>
> Neil
>
>
> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>>Not trying to be a smartass here . . . genuinely curious . . . is the
>>difference in those higher sample rates & resolution clearly audible? If
>
>>you put us all in a room and did a blindfold test, how many of us would
>
>>pass? I only ask because I'm not sure I would.
>>
>>S
>>
>>
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a18916$1@linux...
>>>
>>> "Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>
>>> In my case:

>>>
>>> a.) Higher sample rates & resolution.
>>>
>>> b.) MIDI functionality.
>>>
>>> c.) The ability to seamlessly integrate the bazillion
>>> inexpensive and/or free VST plugins that are available out
>>> there with no need for wrappers & hence features that may or
>>> may not work.
>>>
>>> Neil
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Cujjo on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 23:02:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Native plugs on auxes would be nice. Perhaps the UAD Plate.

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>
>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>
>In my case:
>
>a.) Higher sample rates & resolution.
>
>b.) MIDI functionality.
>
>c.) The ability to seamlessly integrate the bazillion
>inexpensive and/or free VST plugins that are available out
>there with no need for wrappers & hence features that may or
>may not work.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Sarah on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 23:11:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's what I'm doing, except that my midi slave is Cubase V or something.

Nice, simple setup for non-techheads like me. :)

S

"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote in message
news:46a20dcd$1@linux...
>
> Never left. Use it exclusively with Performer slaved to it to do
> seamless
> midi.
>
> Won't even think of leaving till it all breaks down. :)
>
> Lou

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Sarah on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 23:40:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah, well it certainly makes logical sense that the higher resolutions
would provide a more detailed translation back into audible sound, maybe I
just doubt my own ability to hear those details.

What about the fact that so many consumers now are listening to massively
squished versions of all that resolution (mp3, iTunes, etc)? Do you think
the sonic elements provided by the higher resolution survive the squishing?

S

"Neil" <IOUIOU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a22066$1@linux...
>
> All of you would hear a difference... except for Deej, who
> would purposely pick the wrong one just to be difficult.
>
> :D
>
> Seriously, though - I believe you'd hear a difference... I can,
> and I don't have super-human hearing... people who've recorded
> with me can, vs. stuff they've done elsewhere, but then there
> are so many variables in that kind of comparison it's really
> not a scientific one at all (but then, music isn't all about
> science, is it?). It's not so much about trying to get
> a "higher" high-end, it's that you're allowing content that
> occurs above the 22k Nyquist frequency (if recording at 44.1K)
> to pass through, and being able to then perceive the lower-
> order harmonics of those elements that DO occur below the final

> 22k/CD quality Nyquist frequency. It's not a dramatic
> difference, but it's not so subtle that you can't hear
> a difference... to me it sounds more natural, I guess. You're
> hearing elements of stuff that exists in the real world that
> you wouldn't be hearing if you never allowed them to be
> recorded.
>
> I guess the only way to really confirm this would be to record
> a performance to two identical DAW rigs at the same time, with
> one DAW set at 44.1k & one set at 88.2k or 96k or whatever,
> then mix both identically, convert both down to CD-quality
> 16/44.1 & see if there's a perceiveable difference.
>
>
> Neil
>
>
>
>
> Neil
>
>
> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>>Not trying to be a smartass here . . . genuinely curious . . . is the
>>difference in those higher sample rates & resolution clearly audible? If
>
>>you put us all in a room and did a blindfold test, how many of us would
>
>>pass? I only ask because I'm not sure I would.
>>
>>S
>>
>>
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a18916$1@linux...
>>>
>>> "Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>
>>> In my case:
>>>
>>> a.) Higher sample rates & resolution.
>>>
>>> b.) MIDI functionality.
>>>
>>> c.) The ability to seamlessly integrate the bazillion
>>> inexpensive and/or free VST plugins that are available out
>>> there with no need for wrappers & hence features that may or

>>> may not work.
>>>
>>> Neil
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Nil on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 00:34:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>Yeah, well it certainly makes logical sense that the higher resolutions

>would provide a more detailed translation back into audible sound, maybe
I
>just doubt my own ability to hear those details.
>
>What about the fact that so many consumers now are listening to massively

>squished versions of all that resolution (mp3, iTunes, etc)? Do you think

>the sonic elements provided by the higher resolution survive the squishing?

I think that's even more reason to start out with the highest-
possible quality that you're able to.

Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by erlilo on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 07:36:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Your CD have great sonic qualities too, so why worry?

Erling

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> skrev i melding news:46a29ad9@linux...
> Yeah, well it certainly makes logical sense that the higher resolutions
> would provide a more detailed translation back into audible sound, maybe I
> just doubt my own ability to hear those details.
>
> What about the fact that so many consumers now are listening to massively
> squished versions of all that resolution (mp3, iTunes, etc)? Do you think
> the sonic elements provided by the higher resolution survive the

> squishing?
>
> S

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Bill L on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 14:47:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neil, that logic does not quite track for me. I understand your idea
that at least you can control the initial media and you are doing
everything within your scope to improve the final sound. But IMHO the
difference is far too slight.

The better the reproduction the better able we are to hear a difference
in any part of the audio path, right? Thence the worse the reproduction
the less difference can be heard and the less significant it becomes.

I believe the return is too insignificant for Sarah to go through the
trouble of switching to another rig if the end product is to be replayed
through a 128 mp3 codec.

OTOH if you are doing music that people will hear on really good quality
systems, then darn right one should use high quality media files throughout.

Neil wrote:
> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>> Yeah, well it certainly makes logical sense that the higher resolutions
>
>> would provide a more detailed translation back into audible sound, maybe
> I
>> just doubt my own ability to hear those details.
>>
>> What about the fact that so many consumers now are listening to massively
>
>> squished versions of all that resolution (mp3, iTunes, etc)? Do you think
>
>> the sonic elements provided by the higher resolution survive the squishing?
>
> I think that's even more reason to start out with the highest-
> possible quality that you're able to.
>
> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Bill L on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 14:51:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Midi and I was having to do too many workarounds for plug latency. I
went to a mixer also because I wanted the full studio infrastructure of
a console.

Mikep wrote:
> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans PT)
> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>
> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Neil on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 15:54:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>Neil, that logic does not quite track for me. I understand
>your idea that at least you can control the initial media and
>you are doing everything within your scope to improve the
>final sound. But IMHO the difference is far too slight.

It probably IS slight. - again, the only way to verify would be
to track a project from scratch on identical DAW's running at
different samplerates & take each one all the way down to the
mp3 encoding level, and then a/b them at that stage. But then
again, isn't so much of what we do or try or buy based on
getting a SLIGHT improvement on something? How many mics or
preamps or plugin's have you bought that give you a DRAMATIC
difference over what you were using before in a particular
application? Probably not many unless you were using absolute
crap before & went to something really top-shelf. How many, on
the other hand, have given you a slight improvement that you
were happy with? Probably a lot more!

>I believe the return is too insignificant for Sarah to go
>through the trouble of switching to another rig if the end
>product is to be replayed through a 128 mp3 codec.

Hey, I'm not trying to get anyone to switch to anything... I'm
just responding to questions as to why I went with the methods

I've chosen. If my responses are so compelling that they sound like urges to convert when they're not intended to be, then maybe it's just the truth shining through & making you feel that urge! lol BTW, if we're all convinced that the MP3 standard is what we're realy engineering for, then why doesn't everyone just record in 16/44 MP3 to begin with? No need for conversion in samplerate, bitrate reduction, or encoding of ANY kind, so the argument could then be made that it would come out even better in the end! Chew on that one for awhile.

>OTOH if you are doing music that people will hear on really
>good quality systems, then darn right one should use high
>quality media files throughout.

Look, I've always maintained - and I've said it here on this NG - that great music has been recorded on nearly every possible format & under almost every possible condition... a slight sonic difference isn't going to make or break a song or a CD.... Eurythmics "Sweet Dreams" - recorded on an 8-track in their apartment - sounds fine and was a major hit.
This is not about catering to the high-end audio crowd or taking the "if it's going to end up on mp3 then it doesn't matter" approach, either - nor is it about any increment in between those two extremes... for me it's about trying to find a certain texture & dimension; to me these higher sample rates just sound more natural & more open, and dare I say more "analog".... because remember - there's no Nyquist frequency in analog. ;)

Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by LaMont on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 15:59:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You like Pro Tools editing over Nuendo's?? And you liek Pro Toosl workflow over Neundo??

I've never heard anyone who really used the 2 DAWs state that. Even the most ardent Pro Tools users. They will readily admit, that Neundo/SX workflow and editing is in another league.

Just look at each update to Pro Tools now 7.3. Each update icorporates more and more Neundo/SX liek features .. Pro Tools workflow is still not there yet.. Yes, they have added the right-mouse clicks for gettign to menus, but not as deep as Neundo/SX..

And , Pro Tools (conforming) mouse still is not as slick or fast as Paris.

I have Pro Tools and use HDAcel at the studio in our church, and I'm always
amazed at how it reconized as the DAW leader. I'm not that impressed

"Brad Lyons" <brad@audioandmidi.com> wrote:
>
>I loved Paris for tracking and mixing, but it started to tick me off--numerous
>bugs, lockups, plugins not working properly, mixes bouncing differently
than
>how I mixed them on larger projects, etc. I just couldn't deal with it
anymore,
>fortunately at that time I was taking a break from doing studio work and
>left it behind. I then picked up a Nuendo rig for live recording, I liked
>it...but wasn't in-love with the workflow. Since then, I've put in a pair
>of ProToolsHD3 Accel systems with a Control24 and couldn't be happier.

>
>Brad Lyons
>www.audioandmidi.com
>
>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>
>>I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>PT)
>>and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>>looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>
>>Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Bill L on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 18:43:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well put, Neil. I don't think we are really talking apples and apples,
but I also don't think the difference is even worth arguing about.
That's the kind of mood I'm in.

There actually could be a fairily simple way tocompare projects: take
one recorded and mixed at 88 or 96 and knock the tracks down to 44.1
with a good converter and run the mix again. Not perfectly scientific,
but it would satisfy me I suppose. Have you got a mix you could do that

with?

Neil wrote:
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> Neil, that logic does not quite track for me. I understand
>> your idea that at least you can control the initial media and
>> you are doing everything within your scope to improve the
>> final sound. But IMHO the difference is far too slight.
>
> It probably IS slight. - again, the only way to verify would be
> to track a project from scratch on identical DAW's running at
> different samplerates & take each one all the way down to the
> mp3 encoding level, and then a/b them at that stage. But then
> again, isn't so much of what we do or try or buy based on
> getting a SLIGHT improvement on something? How many mics or
> preamps or plugin's have you bought that give you a DRAMATIC
> difference over what you were using before in a particular
> application? Probably not many unless you were using absolute
> crap before & went to something really top-shelf. How many, on
> the other hand, have given you a slight improvement that you
> were happy with? Probably a lot more!
>
>> I believe the return is too insignificant for Sarah to go
>> through the trouble of switching to another rig if the end
>> product is to be replayed through a 128 mp3 codec.
>
> Hey, I'm not trying to get anyone to switch to anything... I'm
> just responding to questions as to why I went with the methods
> I've chosen. If my responses are so compelling that they sound
> like urges to convert when they're not intended to be, then
> maybe it's just the truth shining through & making you feel
> that urge! lol BTW, if we're all convinced that the MP3
> standard is what we're realy engineering for, then why doesn't
> everyone just record in 16/44 MP3 to begin with? No need for
> conversion in samplerate, bitrate reduction, or encoding of ANY
> kind, so the argument could then be made that it would come out
> even better in the end! Chew on that one for awhile.
>
>> OTOH if you are doing music that people will hear on really
>> good quality systems, then darn right one should use high
>> quality media files throughout.
>
> Look, I've always maintained - and I've said it here on this
> NG - that great music has been recorded on nearly every
> possible format & under almost every possible condition...
> a slight sonic difference isn't going to make or break a song
> or a CD.... Eurythmics "Sweet Dreams" - recorded on an 8-track
> in their apartment - sounds fine and was a major hit.

> This is not about catering to the high-end audio crowd or
> taking the "if it's going to end up on mp3 then it doesn't
> matter" approach, either - nor is it about any increment in
> between those two extremes... for me it's about trying to find
> a certain texture & dimension; to me these higher sample rates
> just sound more natural & more open, and dare I say
> more "analog".... because remember - there's no Nyquist
> frequency in analog. ;)
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Neil on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 19:18:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>Well put, Neil. I don't think we are really talking apples and
apples,
>but I also don't think the difference is even worth arguing about.
>That's the kind of mood I'm in.

You're just in a contrary state of mind - that's fine, let's
go... we're not insulting each other over this, so I'm
happy to argue semantics & philosophy with regard to samplerate
& resolution.

>There actually could be a fairily simple way to compare
>projects: take one recorded and mixed at 88 or 96 and knock
>the tracks down to 44.1 with a good converter and run the mix
>again. Not perfectly scientific, but it would satisfy me I
>suppose.

This wouldn't really be a fair test, IMO, it would be adding
another conversion step to the 44.1 files - you'd be rounding
off two samples worth of 88.2k to produce each 44.1k event
as opposed to grabbing two original/accurate 44.1's of the said
event. IOW, I'm an 88.2k proponent and I wouldn't trust this as
a fair comparison, or else I would've done so already.

>Have you got a mix you could do that with?

Yes, but Lamont would just accuse me of purposely manipulating
the 44.1k version to sound worse. :)

Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Neil on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 19:42:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oh, and apart frm the samplerate resolution, another reason
that it wouldn't be a fair comparison is that the downconverted
44.1k files inthis case WOULD have frequency content that
contained lower-order harmonics of data that was originally
above 22k in them, since they started out as 88.2k files,
whereas if you started out tracking at 44.1k, they wouldn't
have any of this content.

Neil

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>Well put, Neil. I don't think we are really talking apples and
>apples,
>>but I also don't think the difference is even worth arguing about.
>>That's the kind of mood I'm in.
>
>You're just in a contrary state of mind - that's fine, let's
>go... we're not insulting each other over this, so I'm
>happy to argue semantics & philosophy with regard to samplerate
>& resolution.
>
>>There actually could be a fairily simple way to compare
>>projects: take one recorded and mixed at 88 or 96 and knock
>>the tracks down to 44.1 with a good converter and run the mix
>>again. Not perfectly scientific, but it would satisfy me I
>>suppose.
>
>This wouldn't really be a fair test, IMO, it would be adding
>another conversion step to the 44.1 files - you'd be rounding
>off two samples worth of 88.2k to produce each 44.1k event
>as opposed to grabbing two original/accurate 44.1's of the said
>event. IOW, I'm an 88.2k proponent and I wouldn't trust this as
>a fair comparison, or else I would've done so already.
>
>>Have you got a mix you could do that with?
>
>Yes, but Lamont would just accuse me of purposely manipulating
>the 44.1k version to sound worse. :)
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by John Macy on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 20:15:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No native here, though I sometimes export wavs to my 002R to do some things like melodyne and AT5 that is not on my Paris rig.

I am kinda old school--don't use MIDI, like the low latency of Paris so I use lots of analog inserts on tracks etc...

That said, I am shopping for an HD3 rig for the new studio (of course, that is for the independent engineers, not me... :)

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>Hey John... are you using any native DAW software at all?
>Either integrated with Paris on a separate PC, or as a stand-
>alone app for certain projects? Just wondering.
>
>Neil
>
>
>"John Macy" <spamlessjohn@johnmacy.com> wrote:
>>
>>Who's leaving? :)
>>
>>Still love it--use it everyday and make a good living with it...
>>
>>
>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>> I haven't left it either, only augmented it. The reason I see will be
>midi,
>>
>>>virtual synths and higher sample rates. On the hardware side, when we
can
>>no
>>>longer get compatible motherboards or expansion chassis and all my stock
>>of
>>>them dies, it's time to get native full bore.
>>>
>>>AA
>>>
>>>
>>>"Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote in message
>>>news:46a116f2$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>>

>>>> PT)
>>>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now,
>but
>>>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>>
>>>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 20:54:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Now if we could just get the marketing to flip flop so it follows the
reality of what you and many of us know about Nuendo vs. ProTools.

I completely agree - the workflow with PT always seemed a bit awkward (much
like Avid vs. Vegas, or even Avid vs. FCP to some degree).

Lamont - Nuendo 4 is just around the corner with some really nice updates -
new automation system for one.... maybe not a lot for music users, but a
nice update list for post.

Dedric

On 7/22/07 9:59 AM, in article 46a37ee9$1@linux, "LaMont"
<jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
> You like Pro Tools editing over Nuendo's?? And you liek Pro Toosl workflow
> over Neundo??
>
> I've never heard anyone who really used the 2 DAWs state that. Even the most
> ardent Pro Tools users. They will readily admit, that Neundo/SX workflow
> and editing is in another league.
>
> Just look at each update to Pro Tools now 7.3. Each update icorporates more
> and more Neundo/SX liek features .. Pro Tools workflow is still not there
> yet.. Yes, they have added the right-mouse clicks for gettign to menus, but
> not as deep as Neundo/SX..
>
> And , Pro Tools (conforming) mouse still is not as slick or fast as Paris.

>
>
> I have Pro Tools and use HDAcel at the studio in our church, and I'm always
> amazed at how it reconized as the DAW leader. I'm not that impressed
>
> "Brad Lyons" <brad@audioandmidi.com> wrote:
>>
>> I loved Paris for tracking and mixing, but it started to tick me
>> off--numerous
>> bugs, lockups, plugins not working properly, mixes bouncing differently
> than
>> how I mixed them on larger projects, etc. I just couldn't deal with it
> anymore,
>> fortunately at that time I was taking a break from doing studio work and
>> left it behind. I then picked up a Nuendo rig for live recording, I liked
>> it...but wasn't in-love with the workflow. Since then, I've put in a pair
>> of ProToolsHD3 Accel systems with a Control24 and couldn't be happier.
>
>>
>> Brad Lyons
>> www.audioandmidi.com
>>
>> "Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>> PT)
>>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>
>>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Bill L on Mon, 23 Jul 2007 01:43:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, now I'm pretty sure you have not thought this through. Those
"lower-order harmonics of data....above 22k" would necessarily still be
there whether it was down-sampled or originally converted as 44.1. We
are talking about air pressure waves. The waves are either there or not.
They are not *attached* to the above 22K information, they are the
result of the above 22K information, which was there in the room when
the mic was used.

My guess is the reason that higher frequency content that is inaudible
to us makes a difference is because the lower order harmonics sound
wrong or out of place or even distorted in some way without the
continued contribution of the upper end data that originally caused
them. OR we can perceive the data in some way without actually hearing it.

Neil wrote:
> Oh, and apart frm the samplerate resolution, another reason
> that it wouldn't be a fair comparison is that the downconverted
> 44.1k files inthis case WOULD have frequency content that
> contained lower-order harmonics of data that was originally
> above 22k in them, since they started out as 88.2k files,
> whereas if you started out tracking at 44.1k, they wouldn't
> have any of this content.
>
> Neil
>
>
>
> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> Well put, Neil. I don't think we are really talking apples and
>> apples,
>>> but I also don't think the difference is even worth arguing about.
>>> That's the kind of mood I'm in.
>> You're just in a contrary state of mind - that's fine, let's
>> go... we're not insulting each other over this, so I'm
>> happy to argue semantics & philosophy with regard to samplerate
>> & resolution.
>>
>>> There actually could be a fairily simple way to compare
>>> projects: take one recorded and mixed at 88 or 96 and knock
>>> the tracks down to 44.1 with a good converter and run the mix
>>> again. Not perfectly scientific, but it would satisfy me I
>>> suppose.
>> This wouldn't really be a fair test, IMO, it would be adding
>> another conversion step to the 44.1 files - you'd be rounding
>> off two samples worth of 88.2k to produce each 44.1k event
>> as opposed to grabbing two original/accurate 44.1's of the said
>> event. IOW, I'm an 88.2k proponent and I wouldn't trust this as
>> a fair comparison, or else I would've done so already.
>>
>>> Have you got a mix you could do that with?
>> Yes, but Lamont would just accuse me of purposely manipulating
>> the 44.1k version to sound worse. :)
>>
>> Neil

>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Neil on Mon, 23 Jul 2007 02:19:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oh, getting fiesty now, are you? :)

OK, try this... track something, anything, into your 44.1k DAW
of choice, using a matched pair of mics, and split it equitably
into two tracks - one that has a mic pre & an EQ engaged, but
no EQ tweaking done - let's call that track "A", and one that
has the same kind of mic pre and EQ engaged, but with a lo-pass
at 10k - let's call that track "B".

Now, play back both tracks, but route track "A" through the
same EQ & set your lo-pass at 10k just like you did when
tracking "B", and play both back. If you can say there's no
difference between the two tracks; IOW, the fact that track
"A" had content above the range that track "B" was allowed to
have from the get-go, regardless of what kind of content
they're allowed to pass on playback, then i'll quit arguing
with you about 44.1k vs. 88.2k (i'll still record at 88.2k,
i'll just quit arguing with you about it lol).

Neil

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>OK, now I'm pretty sure you have not thought this through. Those
>"lower-order harmonics of data....above 22k" would necessarily still be

>there whether it was down-sampled or originally converted as 44.1. We
>are talking about air pressure waves. The waves are either there or not.

>They are not *attached* to the above 22K information, they are the
>*result* of the above 22K information, which was there in the room when

>the mic was used.
>
>My guess is the reason that higher frequency content that is inaudible
>to us makes a difference is because the lower order harmonics sound
>wrong or out of place or even distorted in some way without the
>continued contribution of the upper end data that originally caused
>them. OR we can perceive the data in some way without actually hearing it.
>
>Neil wrote:

>> Oh, and apart frm the samplerate resolution, another reason
>> that it wouldn't be a fair comparison is that the downconverted
>> 44.1k files inthis case WOULD have frequency content that
>> contained lower-order harmonics of data that was originally
>> above 22k in them, since they started out as 88.2k files,
>> whereas if you started out tracking at 44.1k, they wouldn't
>> have any of this content.
>>
>> Neil
>>
>>
>>
>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>> Well put, Neil. I don't think we are really talking apples and
>>> apples,
>>>> but I also don't think the difference is even worth arguing about.
>>>> That's the kind of mood I'm in.
>>> You're just in a contrary state of mind - that's fine, let's
>>> go... we're not insulting each other over this, so I'm
>>> happy to argue semantics & philosophy with regard to samplerate
>>> & resolution.
>>>
>>>> There actually could be a fairily simple way to compare
>>>> projects: take one recorded and mixed at 88 or 96 and knock
>>>> the tracks down to 44.1 with a good converter and run the mix
>>>> again. Not perfectly scientific, but it would satisfy me I
>>>> suppose.
>>> This wouldn't really be a fair test, IMO, it would be adding
>>> another conversion step to the 44.1 files - you'd be rounding
>>> off two samples worth of 88.2k to produce each 44.1k event
>>> as opposed to grabbing two original/accurate 44.1's of the said
>>> event. IOW, I'm an 88.2k proponent and I wouldn't trust this as
>>> a fair comparison, or else I would've done so already.
>>>
>>>> Have you got a mix you could do that with?
>>> Yes, but Lamont would just accuse me of purposely manipulating
>>> the 44.1k version to sound worse. :)
>>>
>>> Neil
>>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Nei on Mon, 23 Jul 2007 02:34:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'll also amplify & riff a bit on something you said:

"OR we can perceive the data in some way without actually hearing it."

I've always believed this to be the case... there's a story that Rupert Neve tells about how Geoff Emerick found a bad channel in a Neve console that was being installed - I believe it was at one of the AIR studios - upon testing, it turned out that the channel had a bad capacitor that was oscillating at slightly over 30k. Now, can we hear 30k? according to lots of people, we can't - and maybe neither could Geoff; but have you ever noticed how 60hz hits you in the groin, 80hz hits you in the solar plexus, and 250hz hits you right in the throat? Crank up Billy Joel's "We Didn't Start the Fire" or "Downeaster Alexa" sometime - that kick is hitting you right in the throat... you can't listen to it too loud for too long! I have no idea why TLA hit the frequency so hard, but in those songs he sure did.

Maybe 30k hits you right in the 13th chakra or something like that.

Neil

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>Oh, getting fiesty now, are you? :)
>
>OK, try this... track something, anything, into your 44.1k DAW
>of choice, using a matched pair of mics, and split it equitably
>into two tracks - one that has a mic pre & an EQ engaged, but
>no EQ tweaking done - let's call that track "A", and one that
>has the same kind of mic pre and EQ engaged, but with a lo-pass
>at 10k - let's call that track "B".
>
>Now, play back both tracks, but route track "A" through the
>same EQ & set your lo-pass at 10k just like you did when
>tracking "B", and play both back. If you can say there's no
>difference between the two tracks; IOW, the fact that track
>"A" had content above the range that track "B" was allowed to
>have from the get-go, regardless of what kind of content
>they're allowed to pass on playback, then i'll quit arguing
>with you about 44.1k vs. 88.2k (i'll still record at 88.2k,
>i'll just quit arguing with you about it lol).
>
>Neil

>
>
>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>OK, now I'm pretty sure you have not thought this through. Those
>>"lower-order harmonics of data....above 22k" would necessarily still be
>
>>there whether it was down-sampled or originally converted as 44.1. We
>>are talking about air pressure waves. The waves are either there or not.
>
>>They are not *attached* to the above 22K information, they are the
>>*result* of the above 22K information, which was there in the room when
>
>>the mic was used.
>>
>>My guess is the reason that higher frequency content that is inaudible

>>to us makes a difference is because the lower order harmonics sound
>>wrong or out of place or even distorted in some way without the
>>continued contribution of the upper end data that originally caused
>>them. OR we can perceive the data in some way without actually hearing
it.
>>
>>Neil wrote:
>>> Oh, and apart frm the samplerate resolution, another reason
>>> that it wouldn't be a fair comparison is that the downconverted
>>> 44.1k files inthis case WOULD have frequency content that
>>> contained lower-order harmonics of data that was originally
>>> above 22k in them, since they started out as 88.2k files,
>>> whereas if you started out tracking at 44.1k, they wouldn't
>>> have any of this content.
>>>
>>> Neil
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>> Well put, Neil. I don't think we are really talking apples and
>>>> apples,
>>>>> but I also don't think the difference is even worth arguing about.

>>>>> That's the kind of mood I'm in.
>>>> You're just in a contrary state of mind - that's fine, let's
>>>> go... we're not insulting each other over this, so I'm
>>>> happy to argue semantics & philosophy with regard to samplerate
>>>> & resolution.
>>>>
>>>>> There actually could be a fairily simple way to compare

>>>>> projects: take one recorded and mixed at 88 or 96 and knock
>>>>> the tracks down to 44.1 with a good converter and run the mix
>>>>> again. Not perfectly scientific, but it would satisfy me I
>>>>> suppose.
>>>> This wouldn't really be a fair test, IMO, it would be adding
>>>> another conversion step to the 44.1 files - you'd be rounding
>>>> off two samples worth of 88.2k to produce each 44.1k event
>>>> as opposed to grabbing two original/accurate 44.1's of the said
>>>> event. IOW, I'm an 88.2k proponent and I wouldn't trust this as
>>>> a fair comparison, or else I would've done so already.
>>>>
>>>>> Have you got a mix you could do that with?
>>>> Yes, but Lamont would just accuse me of purposely manipulating
>>>> the 44.1k version to sound worse. :)
>>>>
>>>> Neil
>>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Sarah on Mon, 23 Jul 2007 03:05:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey, I'm not worried, just curious. Or maybe I don't want to be seen as
stubbornly old-fashioned. :)

And thank you.

Sarah

"erlilo" <erlilo@nospamonline.no> wrote in message news:46a30a5e@linux...
> Your CD have great sonic qualities too, so why worry?
>
> Erling
>
> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> skrev i melding news:46a29ad9@linux...
>> Yeah, well it certainly makes logical sense that the higher resolutions
>> would provide a more detailed translation back into audible sound, maybe
>> I just doubt my own ability to hear those details.
>>
>> What about the fact that so many consumers now are listening to massively
>> squished versions of all that resolution (mp3, iTunes, etc)? Do you
>> think the sonic elements provided by the higher resolution survive the
>> squishing?
>>
>> S
>

>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by LaMont on Mon, 23 Jul 2007 17:44:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Can't wait..

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>Now if we could just get the marketing to flip flop so it follows the
>reality of what you and many of us know about Nuendo vs. ProTools.
>
>I completely agree - the workflow with PT always seemed a bit awkward (much
>like Avid vs. Vegas, or even Avid vs. FCP to some degree).
>
>Lamont - Nuendo 4 is just around the corner with some really nice updates
-
>new automation system for one.... maybe not a lot for music users, but a
>nice update list for post.
>
>Dedric
>
>On 7/22/07 9:59 AM, in article 46a37ee9$1@linux, "LaMont"
><jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> You like Pro Tools editing over Nuendo's?? And you liek Pro Toosl workflow
>> over Neundo??
>>
>> I've never heard anyone who really used the 2 DAWs state that. Even the
most
>> ardent Pro Tools users. They will readily admit, that Neundo/SX workflow
>> and editing is in another league.
>>
>> Just look at each update to Pro Tools now 7.3. Each update icorporates
more
>> and more Neundo/SX liek features .. Pro Tools workflow is still not there
>> yet.. Yes, they have added the right-mouse clicks for gettign to menus,
but
>> not as deep as Neundo/SX..
>>
>> And , Pro Tools (conforming) mouse still is not as slick or fast as Paris.
>>
>>
>> I have Pro Tools and use HDAcel at the studio in our church, and I'm always
>> amazed at how it reconized as the DAW leader. I'm not that impressed
>>

>> "Brad Lyons" <brad@audioandmidi.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> I loved Paris for tracking and mixing, but it started to tick me
>>> off--numerous
>>> bugs, lockups, plugins not working properly, mixes bouncing differently
>> than
>>> how I mixed them on larger projects, etc. I just couldn't deal with
it
>> anymore,
>>> fortunately at that time I was taking a break from doing studio work
and
>>> left it behind. I then picked up a Nuendo rig for live recording, I
liked
>>> it...but wasn't in-love with the workflow. Since then, I've put in a
pair
>>> of ProToolsHD3 Accel systems with a Control24 and couldn't be happier.
>>
>>>
>>> Brad Lyons
>>> www.audioandmidi.com
>>>
>>> "Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>>> PT)
>>>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now,
but
>>>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>>
>>>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Bill L on Tue, 24 Jul 2007 01:28:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I knew you were referring to that story. I don't disagree. My point was
just that whatever was happening in the lower band resulting from upper
frequency data would still be there if the upper data were not recorded.
Just the upper data would not be there. All I meant is that
down-sampling probably would yield a track very similar (though not the
same) to a track recorded at 44.1. So for purposes of experimentation on

a mix it would be acceptable to me.

On the EQ thing, who knows? Have you tried it? Besides, putting matched mics on the same source is already such a variable the rest of the test is useless. You knew that, but wondered if I would fall for it. Hah! I ain't your sucker, bro.

Neil wrote:
> I'll also amplify & riff a bit on something you said:
>
> "OR we can perceive the data in some way without actually
> hearing it."
>
> I've always believed this to be the case... there's a story
> that Rupert Neve tells about how Geoff Emerick found a bad
> channel in a Neve console that was being installed - I believe
> it was at one of the AIR studios - upon testing, it turned out
> that the channel had a bad capacitor that was oscillating at
> slightly over 30k. Now, can we hear 30k? according to lots of
> people, we can't - and maybe neither could Geoff; but have you
> ever noticed how 60hz hits you in the groin, 80hz hits you in
> the solar plexus, and 250hz hits you right in the throat? Crank
> up Billy Joel's "We Didn't Start the Fire" or "Downeaster
> Alexa" sometime - that kick is hitting you right in the
> throat... you can't listen to it too loud for too long! I have
> no idea why TLA hit the frequency so hard, but in those songs
> he sure did.
>
> Maybe 30k hits you right in the 13th chakra or something like
> that.
>
> Neil
>
>
>
> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>> Oh, getting fiesty now, are you? :)
>>
>> OK, try this... track something, anything, into your 44.1k DAW
>> of choice, using a matched pair of mics, and split it equitably
>> into two tracks - one that has a mic pre & an EQ engaged, but
>> no EQ tweaking done - let's call that track "A", and one that
>> has the same kind of mic pre and EQ engaged, but with a lo-pass
>> at 10k - let's call that track "B".
>>
>> Now, play back both tracks, but route track "A" through the
>> same EQ & set your lo-pass at 10k just like you did when
>> tracking "B", and play both back. If you can say there's no

>> difference between the two tracks; IOW, the fact that track
>> "A" had content above the range that track "B" was allowed to
>> have from the get-go, regardless of what kind of content
>> they're allowed to pass on playback, then i'll quit arguing
>> with you about 44.1k vs. 88.2k (i'll still record at 88.2k,
>> i'll just quit arguing with you about it lol).
>>
>> Neil
>>
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> OK, now I'm pretty sure you have not thought this through. Those
>>> "lower-order harmonics of data....above 22k" would necessarily still be
>>> there whether it was down-sampled or originally converted as 44.1. We
>>> are talking about air pressure waves. The waves are either there or not.
>>> They are not *attached* to the above 22K information, they are the
>>> *result* of the above 22K information, which was there in the room when
>>> the mic was used.
>>>
>>> My guess is the reason that higher frequency content that is inaudible
>
>>> to us makes a difference is because the lower order harmonics sound
>>> wrong or out of place or even distorted in some way without the
>>> continued contribution of the upper end data that originally caused
>>> them. OR we can perceive the data in some way without actually hearing
> it.
>>> Neil wrote:
>>>> Oh, and apart frm the samplerate resolution, another reason
>>>> that it wouldn't be a fair comparison is that the downconverted
>>>> 44.1k files inthis case WOULD have frequency content that
>>>> contained lower-order harmonics of data that was originally
>>>> above 22k in them, since they started out as 88.2k files,
>>>> whereas if you started out tracking at 44.1k, they wouldn't
>>>> have any of this content.
>>>>
>>>> Neil
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Well put, Neil. I don't think we are really talking apples and
>>>>> apples,
>>>>>> but I also don't think the difference is even worth arguing about.
>
>>>>>> That's the kind of mood I'm in.
>>>>> You're just in a contrary state of mind - that's fine, let's
>>>>> go... we're not insulting each other over this, so I'm

>>>>> happy to argue semantics & philosophy with regard to samplerate
>>>>> & resolution.
>>>>>
>>>>>> There actually could be a fairily simple way to compare
>>>>>> projects: take one recorded and mixed at 88 or 96 and knock
>>>>>> the tracks down to 44.1 with a good converter and run the mix
>>>>>> again. Not perfectly scientific, but it would satisfy me I
>>>>>> suppose.
>>>>> This wouldn't really be a fair test, IMO, it would be adding
>>>>> another conversion step to the 44.1 files - you'd be rounding
>>>>> off two samples worth of 88.2k to produce each 44.1k event
>>>>> as opposed to grabbing two original/accurate 44.1's of the said
>>>>> event. IOW, I'm an 88.2k proponent and I wouldn't trust this as
>>>>> a fair comparison, or else I would've done so already.
>>>>>
>>>>>> Have you got a mix you could do that with?
>>>>> Yes, but Lamont would just accuse me of purposely manipulating
>>>>> the 44.1k version to sound worse. :)
>>>>>
>>>>> Neil
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Neil on Tue, 24 Jul 2007 04:19:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>I knew you were referring to that story. I don't disagree. My point was

>just that whatever was happening in the lower band resulting from upper

>frequency data would still be there if the upper data were not recorded.

>Just the upper data would not be there. All I meant is that
>down-sampling probably would yield a track very similar (though not the

>same) to a track recorded at 44.1. So for purposes of experimentation on

>a mix it would be acceptable to me.

I'll see if I can find some time to convert a portion of a mix
& drop it into the same template... this would be a somewhat
time-consuming task, as I'd have to render all tracks from the
same start point, then convert/downsample afterward (otherwise
they wouldn't lock into the same sample position & things would
be off in terms of timing where punch-points are concerned), so
lemmesee if I can get some time to do this. I still don't think

it's an accurate comparison, but we'll see.

Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Bill L on Wed, 25 Jul 2007 01:16:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah go for it. I would love to hear it. I'm actually surprised we
haven't heard about someone already doing this very thing.

Neil wrote:
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> I knew you were referring to that story. I don't disagree. My point was
>
>> just that whatever was happening in the lower band resulting from upper
>
>> frequency data would still be there if the upper data were not recorded.
>
>> Just the upper data would not be there. All I meant is that
>> down-sampling probably would yield a track very similar (though not the
>
>> same) to a track recorded at 44.1. So for purposes of experimentation on
>
>> a mix it would be acceptable to me.
>
> I'll see if I can find some time to convert a portion of a mix
> & drop it into the same template... this would be a somewhat
> time-consuming task, as I'd have to render all tracks from the
> same start point, then convert/downsample afterward (otherwise
> they wouldn't lock into the same sample position & things would
> be off in terms of timing where punch-points are concerned), so
> lemmesee if I can get some time to do this. I still don't think
> it's an accurate comparison, but we'll see.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Bill L on Wed, 25 Jul 2007 12:20:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I hear that C4's big bug fix is around the corner too. I wonder if they
don't let Cubase users find the bugs and then incorporate the refined
code in Nuendo?

Dedric Terry wrote:
> Now if we could just get the marketing to flip flop so it follows the
> reality of what you and many of us know about Nuendo vs. ProTools.
>
> I completely agree - the workflow with PT always seemed a bit awkward (much
> like Avid vs. Vegas, or even Avid vs. FCP to some degree).
>
> Lamont - Nuendo 4 is just around the corner with some really nice updates -
> new automation system for one.... maybe not a lot for music users, but a
> nice update list for post.
>
> Dedric
>
> On 7/22/07 9:59 AM, in article 46a37ee9$1@linux, "LaMont"
> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>> You like Pro Tools editing over Nuendo's?? And you liek Pro Toosl workflow
>> over Neundo??
>>
>> I've never heard anyone who really used the 2 DAWs state that. Even the most
>> ardent Pro Tools users. They will readily admit, that Neundo/SX workflow
>> and editing is in another league.
>>
>> Just look at each update to Pro Tools now 7.3. Each update icorporates more
>> and more Neundo/SX liek features .. Pro Tools workflow is still not there
>> yet.. Yes, they have added the right-mouse clicks for gettign to menus, but
>> not as deep as Neundo/SX..
>>
>> And , Pro Tools (conforming) mouse still is not as slick or fast as Paris.
>>
>>
>> I have Pro Tools and use HDAcel at the studio in our church, and I'm always
>> amazed at how it reconized as the DAW leader. I'm not that impressed
>>
>> "Brad Lyons" <brad@audioandmidi.com> wrote:
>>> I loved Paris for tracking and mixing, but it started to tick me
>>> off--numerous
>>> bugs, lockups, plugins not working properly, mixes bouncing differently
>> than
>>> how I mixed them on larger projects, etc. I just couldn't deal with it
>> anymore,
>>> fortunately at that time I was taking a break from doing studio work and
>>> left it behind. I then picked up a Nuendo rig for live recording, I liked
>>> it...but wasn't in-love with the workflow. Since then, I've put in a pair
>>> of ProToolsHD3 Accel systems with a Control24 and couldn't be happier.
>>> Brad Lyons
>>> www.audioandmidi.com
>>>

>>> "Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>>> PT)
>>>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now, but
>>>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>>
>>>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>>>
>>>>
>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by LaMont on Wed, 25 Jul 2007 15:45:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Bill, I did not take the C4 bait.. it's been my experience with Steinberg
to "wait" for a few revisions before updating..

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>I hear that C4's big bug fix is around the corner too. I wonder if they

>don't let Cubase users find the bugs and then incorporate the refined
>code in Nuendo?
>
>Dedric Terry wrote:
>> Now if we could just get the marketing to flip flop so it follows the
>> reality of what you and many of us know about Nuendo vs. ProTools.
>>
>> I completely agree - the workflow with PT always seemed a bit awkward
(much
>> like Avid vs. Vegas, or even Avid vs. FCP to some degree).
>>
>> Lamont - Nuendo 4 is just around the corner with some really nice updates
-
>> new automation system for one.... maybe not a lot for music users, but
a
>> nice update list for post.
>>
>> Dedric
>>
>> On 7/22/07 9:59 AM, in article 46a37ee9$1@linux, "LaMont"
>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>> You like Pro Tools editing over Nuendo's?? And you liek Pro Toosl workflow
>>> over Neundo??
>>>

>>> I've never heard anyone who really used the 2 DAWs state that. Even the
most
>>> ardent Pro Tools users. They will readily admit, that Neundo/SX workflow
>>> and editing is in another league.
>>>
>>> Just look at each update to Pro Tools now 7.3. Each update icorporates
more
>>> and more Neundo/SX liek features .. Pro Tools workflow is still not there
>>> yet.. Yes, they have added the right-mouse clicks for gettign to menus,
but
>>> not as deep as Neundo/SX..
>>>
>>> And , Pro Tools (conforming) mouse still is not as slick or fast as Paris.
>>>
>>>
>>> I have Pro Tools and use HDAcel at the studio in our church, and I'm
always
>>> amazed at how it reconized as the DAW leader. I'm not that impressed
>>>
>>> "Brad Lyons" <brad@audioandmidi.com> wrote:
>>>> I loved Paris for tracking and mixing, but it started to tick me
>>>> off--numerous
>>>> bugs, lockups, plugins not working properly, mixes bouncing differently
>>> than
>>>> how I mixed them on larger projects, etc. I just couldn't deal with
it
>>> anymore,
>>>> fortunately at that time I was taking a break from doing studio work
and
>>>> left it behind. I then picked up a Nuendo rig for live recording, I
liked
>>>> it...but wasn't in-love with the workflow. Since then, I've put in
a pair
>>>> of ProToolsHD3 Accel systems with a Control24 and couldn't be happier.
>>>> Brad Lyons
>>>> www.audioandmidi.com
>>>>
>>>> "Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>>>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris (sans
>>>> PT)
>>>>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now,
but
>>>>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>>>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?
>>>>>
>>>>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>>>>
>>>>>

>>

Subject: Re: Your biggest reason for leaving Paris?
Posted by Neil on Thu, 26 Jul 2007 04:33:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's been my experience never to be a "paying beta-tester" for
anything - I always wait 'til version 1-point-something at the
very least.

Neil

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>Hi Bill, I did not take the C4 bait.. it's been my experience with Steinberg
>to "wait" for a few revisions before updating..
>
>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>I hear that C4's big bug fix is around the corner too. I wonder if they
>
>>don't let Cubase users find the bugs and then incorporate the refined
>>code in Nuendo?
>>
>>Dedric Terry wrote:
>>> Now if we could just get the marketing to flip flop so it follows the
>>> reality of what you and many of us know about Nuendo vs. ProTools.
>>>
>>> I completely agree - the workflow with PT always seemed a bit awkward
>(much
>>> like Avid vs. Vegas, or even Avid vs. FCP to some degree).
>>>
>>> Lamont - Nuendo 4 is just around the corner with some really nice updates
>-
>>> new automation system for one.... maybe not a lot for music users, but
>a
>>> nice update list for post.
>>>
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 7/22/07 9:59 AM, in article 46a37ee9$1@linux, "LaMont"
>>> <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>> You like Pro Tools editing over Nuendo's?? And you liek Pro Toosl workflow
>>>> over Neundo??
>>>>
>>>> I've never heard anyone who really used the 2 DAWs state that. Even

the
>most
>>>> ardent Pro Tools users. They will readily admit, that Neundo/SX workflow
>>>> and editing is in another league.
>>>>
>>>> Just look at each update to Pro Tools now 7.3. Each update icorporates
>more
>>>> and more Neundo/SX liek features .. Pro Tools workflow is still not
there
>>>> yet.. Yes, they have added the right-mouse clicks for gettign to menus,
>but
>>>> not as deep as Neundo/SX..
>>>>
>>>> And , Pro Tools (conforming) mouse still is not as slick or fast as
Paris.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> I have Pro Tools and use HDAcel at the studio in our church, and I'm
>always
>>>> amazed at how it reconized as the DAW leader. I'm not that impressed
>>>>
>>>> "Brad Lyons" <brad@audioandmidi.com> wrote:
>>>>> I loved Paris for tracking and mixing, but it started to tick me
>>>>> off--numerous
>>>>> bugs, lockups, plugins not working properly, mixes bouncing differently
>>>> than
>>>>> how I mixed them on larger projects, etc. I just couldn't deal with
>it
>>>> anymore,
>>>>> fortunately at that time I was taking a break from doing studio work
>and
>>>>> left it behind. I then picked up a Nuendo rig for live recording,
I
>liked
>>>>> it...but wasn't in-love with the workflow. Since then, I've put in
>a pair
>>>>> of ProToolsHD3 Accel systems with a Control24 and couldn't be happier.
>>>>> Brad Lyons
>>>>> www.audioandmidi.com
>>>>>
>>>>> "Mikep" <mikep@hometownrecords.com> wrote:
>>>>>> I have been looking at the current popular atlternatives to Paris
(sans
>>>>> PT)
>>>>>> and I'm not impressed. I have no reason to change systems right now,
>but
>>>>>> looking forward I know I'll need to update sometime.
>>>>>> I was just wondering what some of your reasons were to change?

>>>>>>
>>>>>> Right now the biggest asset to me would be Nuendo's latency compensation.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>
>