
Subject: Waves SSL Channel Strip vs UAD-1 Neve 88RS Channel strip vs URS Console Strip

Posted by [DJ](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 03:00:39 GMT

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

A friend is going to be down for a while and brought his URS and Waves plugins over for me to demo. I Ghosted my OS and loaded them up.

though they sound a bit different from each other, it's amazing how good they sound in their own right. IMO, the UAD stuff still has a bit of an edge over native, but it's totally subjective at this point. I'm very impressed by the Waves SSL bundle but it's still a bit "2D" compared to the UAD-1 processors (again IMO). I wonder how it measures up to their Duende system.

Some of the tools we have nowadays are truly amazing. If I was still running Paris, I'd have it loaded on XP and I'd have the URS and Waves plugins and wouldn't even be trying to deal with the latency issues and workarounds associated with using UAD-1 cards. The Waves stuff is close enough to "a reality" as far as emulating hardware these days that I personally wouldn't feel like I was missing much.

Subject: Re: Waves SSL Channel Strip vs UAD-1 Neve 88RS Channel strip vs URS Console Strip

Posted by [laMont \[1\]](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 05:52:29 GMT

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

That's what I've been saying. The My URS's and SSL along with Sonalkis, does it for me without having to purchase the UADs.

However, those who have both the UAD and the URS, say that the UADs plugs are still the best.

I wonder how does the new Waves Vintage series (API, NEVE,) <http://www.waves.com/Content.aspx?id=1680> fair against the UAD plugins.

Those new waves plugs look wicked, and I hear that they sound great was well.

Lastly, the Waves SSL plugins sounds and work great with Paris. But, I hear that the Duende version of the plugs sound better, BUT, Duende has some driver issues..

**Don't count out the Focusrite Liquid Mix. Their emulations are nice as well..

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:

>A friend is going to be down for a while and brought his URS and Waves
>plugins over for me to demo. I Ghosted my OS and loaded them up.

>

>though they sound a bit different from each other, it's amazing how good

>they sound in their own right. IMO, the UAD stuff still has a bit of an
edge

>over native, but it's totally subjective at this point. I'm very impressed

>by the Waves SSL bundle but it's still a bit "2D" compared to the UAD-1

>processors (again IMO). I wonder how it measures up to their Duende system.

>

>Some of the tools we have nowadays are truly amazing. If I was still running

>Paris, I'd have it loaded on XP and I'd have the URS and Waves plugins and

>wouldn't even be trying to deal with the latency issues and workarounds

>associated with using UAD-1 cards. The Waves stuff is close enough to "a

>reality" as far as emulating hardware these days that I personally wouldn't

>feel like I was missing much.

>

>

>

Subject: Re: Waves SSL Channel Strip vs UAD-1 Neve 88RS Channel strip vs
URSConsole Strip

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 13:46:55 GMT

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

Don't forget that the original Neve hardware is actually better sounding
than the SSL hardware. No matter how good the emulation, SSL is not Neve...

LaMont wrote:

> That's what I've been saying. The My URS's and SSL along with Sonalkis, does
> it for me without having to purchase the UADs.

> However, those who have both the UAD and the URS, say that the UADs plugs
> are still the best.

>

> I wonder how does the new Waves Vintage series
(API, NEVE,) <http://www.waves.com/Content.aspx?id=1680>

> fair against the UAD plugins.

>
> Those new waves plugs look wicked, and I hear that they sound great was well.
>
> Lastly, the Waves SSL plugins sounds and work great with Paris.
> But, I hear that the Duende version of the plugs sound beter, BUT, Duende
> has some driver issues..
>
> **Don't count out the Focusrite Liquid Mix. Their emulations are nice as
> well..
>
>
>
>
>
>
> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>> A friend is going to be down for a while and brought his URS and Waves
>> plugins over for me to demo. I Ghosted my OS and loaded them up.
>>
>> though they sound a bit different from each other, it's amazing how good
>
>> they sound in their own right. IMO, the UAD stuff still has a bit of an
> edge
>> over native, but it's totally subjective at this point. I'm very impressed
>
>> by the Waves SSL bundle but it's still a bit "2D" compared to the UAD-1
>
>> processors (again IMO). I wonder how it measures up to their Duende system.
>>
>> Some of the tools we have nowadays are truly amazing. If I was still running
>
>> Paris, I'd have it loaded on XP and I'd have the URS and Waves plugins and
>
>> wouldn't even be trying to deal with the latency issues and workarounds
>
>> associated with using UAD-1 cards. The Waves stuff is close enough to "a
>
>> reality" as far as emulating hardware these days that I personally wouldn't
>
>> feel like I was missing much.
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Waves SSL Channel Strip vs UAD-1 Neve 88RS Channel strip vs URS
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 14:16:27 GMT

You are right.. But, for some reason, the SSL E series eq is great on Hip Hop drums, really Crunchy. And, the Buss compressor(Quad Comp) is really unique at what it does.

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>Don't forget that the original Neve hardware is actually better sounding

>than the SSL hardware. No matter how good the emulation, SSL is not Neve...

>

>LaMont wrote:

>> That's what I've been saying. The My URS's and SSL along with Sonalkis, does

>> it for me without having to purchase the UADs.

>> However, those who have both the UAD and the URS, say that the UADs plugs

>> are still the best.

>>

>> li wonder how does the new Waves Vinatge series (API,NEVE,) <http://www.waves.com/Content.aspx?id=1680>

>> fair against the UAD plugins.

>>

>> Those new waves plugs look wicked, and I hear that they sound great was well.

>>

>> Lastly, the Waves SSL plugins sounds and work great with Paris.

>> But, I hear that the Duende version of the plugs sound beter, BUT, Duende

>> has some driver issues..

>>

>> **Don't count out the Focusrite Liquid Mix. Their emulations are nice as

>> well..

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:

>>> A friend is going to be down for a while and brought his URS and Waves

>>> plugins over for me to demo. I Ghosted my OS and loaded them up.

>>>

>>> though they sound a bit different from each other, it's amazing how good

>>>

>>> they sound in their own right. IMO, the UAD stuff still has a bit of an

>> edge

>>> over native, but it's totally subjective at this point. I'm very impressed

>>

>>> by the Waves SSL bundle but it's still a bit "2D" compared to the UAD-1
>>
>>> processors (again IMO). I wonder how it measures up to their Duende system.
>>>
>>> Some of the tools we have nowadays are truly amazing. If I was still
running
>>
>>> Paris, I'd have it loaded on XP and I'd have the URS and Waves plugins
and
>>
>>> wouldn't even be trying to deal with the latency issues and workarounds
>>
>>> associated with using UAD-1 cards. The Waves stuff is close enough to
"a
>>
>>> reality" as far as emulating hardware these days that I personally wouldn't
>>
>>> feel like I was missing much.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>

Subject: Re: Waves SSL Channel Strip vs UAD-1 Neve 88RS Channel strip vs URS
Console Strip

Posted by [TCB](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 14:59:37 GMT

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

I still haven't spent too much time with the LM stuff (we're mostly in endless tracking not mixing mode right now) but from what I've seen it is right up there with the UAD cards. I don't have the Neve plugs for UAD and have long refused to use Waves stuff (the CP is so onerous), but I'm damned impressed.

TCB

"LaMont" <jjdpro@funk.com> wrote:

>
>That's what I've been saying. The My URS's and SSL along with Sonalkis,
does
>it for me without having to purchase the UADs.
>However, those who have both the UAD and the URS, say that the UADs plugs
>are still the best.
>
>I wonder how does the new Waves Vintage series
(API, NEVE,) <http://www.waves.com/Content.aspx?id=1680>
> fair against the UAD plugins.

>
>Those new waves plugs look wicked, and I hear that they sound great was well.
>
>Lastly, the Waves SSL plugins sounds and work great with Paris.
>But, I hear that the Duende version of the plugs sound beter, BUT, Duende
>has some driver issues..
>
>**Don't count out the Focusrite Liquid Mix. Their emulations are nice as
>well..
>
>
>
>
>
>"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>A friend is going to be down for a while and brought his URS and Waves

>>plugins over for me to demo. I Ghosted my OS and loaded them up.
>>
>>though they sound a bit different from each other, it's amazing how good
>
>>they sound in their own right. IMO, the UAD stuff still has a bit of an
>edge
>>over native, but it's totally subjective at this point. I'm very impressed
>
>>by the Waves SSL bundle but it's still a bit "2D" compared to the UAD-1
>
>>processors (again IMO). I wonder how it measures up to their Duende system.
>>
>>Some of the tools we have nowadays are truly amazing. If I was still running
>
>>Paris, I'd have it loaded on XP and I'd have the URS and Waves plugins
and
>
>>wouldn't even be trying to deal with the latency issues and workarounds
>
>>associated with using UAD-1 cards. The Waves stuff is close enough to "a
>
>>reality" as far as emulating hardware these days that I personally wouldn't
>
>>feel like I was missing much.
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Waves SSL Channel Strip vs UAD-1 Neve 88RS Channel strip vs URS
Posted by DJ on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 23:20:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Crunchy" really does describe the Waves SSL comp. I've never used the hardware so I don't have a pint of reference, but yeah.....crunchy nails it.

;o)

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:46ee8c3b\$1@linux...

>

> You are right.. But, for some reason, the SSL E series eq is great on Hip
> Hop drums, really Crunchy. And, the Buss compressor(Quad Comp) is really
> unique at what it does.

>

> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>>Don't forget that the original Neve hardware is actually better sounding

>

>>than the SSL hardware. No matter how good the emulation, SSL is not
>>Neve...

>>

>>LaMont wrote:

>>> That's what I've been saying. The My URS's and SSL along with Sonalkis,
> does

>>> it for me without having to purchase the UADs.

>>> However, those who have both the UAD and the URS, say that the UADs

>>> plugs

>>> are still the best.

>>>

>>> I wonder how does the new Waves Vintage series

>>> (API,NEVE,)http://www.waves.com/Content.aspx?id=1680

>>> fair against the UAD plugins.

>>>

>>> Those new waves plugs look wicked, and I hear that they sound great was
> well.

>>>

>>> Lastly, the Waves SSL plugins sounds and work great with Paris.

>>> But, I hear that the Duende version of the plugs sound better, BUT,

>>> Duende

>>> has some driver issues..

>>>

>>> **Don't count out the Focusrite Liquid Mix. Their emulations are nice

> as

>>> well..

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>
>>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>>> A friend is going to be down for a while and brought his URS and Waves
>
>>>> plugins over for me to demo. I Ghosted my OS and loaded them up.
>>>>
>>>> though they sound a bit different from each other, it's amazing how
>>>> good
>>>
>>>> they sound in their own right. IMO, the UAD stuff still has a bit of
> an
>>> edge
>>>> over native, but it's totally subjective at this point. I'm very
>>>> impressed
>>>
>>>> by the Waves SSL bundle but it's still a bit "2D" compared to the UAD-1
>>>
>>>> processors (again IMO). I wonder how it measures up to their Duende
>>>> system.
>>>>
>>>> Some of the tools we have nowadays are truly amazing. If I was still
> running
>>>
>>>> Paris, I'd have it loaded on XP and I'd have the URS and Waves plugins
> and
>>>
>>>> wouldn't even be trying to deal with the latency issues and workarounds
>>>
>>>> associated with using UAD-1 cards. The Waves stuff is close enough to
> "a
>>>
>>>> reality" as far as emulating hardware these days that I personally
>>>> wouldn't
>>>
>>>> feel like I was missing much.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>
