
Subject: High Sampling Rates and Hearing
Posted by [emare](#) on Sun, 09 Oct 2005 23:42:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

plugin instance.

> >> >> >Regards,

> >> >> >Dimitrios

> >> >> >

> >> >> >

> >> >>

> >> >

> >> >

> >>

> >

> >

>Yesterday I was doing some location work recording a panel discussion of some heavyweight film songwriters/scorers/producers and publishers who specialize in placing music with film editors and producers.

The issue of higher sample rates and 5.1 mixing came up. The only place higher sample rates were preferred were for ftp'ing MP3's to the publisher for listening sessions prior to sending on the finished *stereo/44.1* final mixes subsequent to approval of the song. Seems that ther

Subject: Re: High Sampling Rates and Hearing
Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 01:35:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> let alone red-book. I disagree. Right now, there are iPods with 60
> gigabytes!

>

> Now, a CD can only 700meg, so we could easily have iPods holding
> 86+ CD's of uncompressed audio! No MP3 crap! It's mainly an
> access speed issue at this point, but I think it will happen, and then
> hi-res will follow.

>

> DC

>

>

> "Mike R." <emare@not.com> wrote:

> >

> >You know, I have read some reports that people actually percieve a
difference

> >between audio sampled at 44k, and audio sampled at 96k. I don't have any
> >96k converters, or I'd give it a shot myself. In all things audio, I'd

> trust

> >this group's ears over
> >m(any) others.
> > If it is audible I'd propose three possibilities:
> >-Our ears are much more sensitive than perviously thought or measured.
(I'd
> >tend to doubt this one...)
> >-We do "hear" the higher frequencies, but with senses other than our
ears.
> > Perhaps our skin, or fine hair on the skin. Much like someone who is
deaf
> >"listens" to music, we are able to percieve the higher frequencies.
> >or...
> >-Its a sort of placebo effect. We think it's there, so it's there.
> >Any thoughts???

> >MR
>Sort of on this topic, anyone notice how bad radio is sounding lately?
Even the Beatle hour is bad "you can't do that" sounded like a real audio
file or something.
I load my Ipod on the highest rate before Apple lossless.

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

>Yesterday I was doing some location work recording a panel discussion of
>some heavyweight film songwriters/scorers/producers and publishers who
>specialize in placing music with film editors and producers.
>
>The issue of higher sample rates and 5.1 mixing came up. The only place
>higher sample rates were preferred were for ftp'ing MP3's to the publisher
>for listening sessions prior to sending on the finished *stereo/44.1* final
>mixes subsequent to approval of the song. Seems that there is some voodoo
>that these folks think they are hearing when MP3's are upsampled to 192kHz.
>I've never done this so maybe there is some validity to it, but anyway,
they
>like having it done this way. As far as the final audio product that is
>heard in the film is concerned, 5.1 and higher sample rates aren't taking
>the world by storm.....not even a little.
>
>Deej
>
>"DC" <dc@spamyermama.com> wrote in message news:4349c570\$1@linux...
>>
>> Here's my .02
>>
>> 1. Everything has to be equal. *Almost always* when someone
>> complains about digital it is because of cheap convertors or bad
>> engineering. Compare the same convertor at different resolutions
>> and you can hear some difference. I've done this with a Lavry and
>> it is real, but of smaller magnitude of improvement than most people
>> expect.

>>
>> The existence of so many recordings transferred back in the 80's
>> on the wretched convertors in the Sony 1630/40 mastering decks
>> is still causing complaints about "digital harshness".
>>

Subject: Re: High Sampling Rates and Hearing
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 02:30:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

en, and then
>> hi-res will follow.
>>
>> DC
>>
>>
>> "Mike R." <emare@not.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >You know, I have read some reports that people actually percieve a
>> >difference
>> >between audio sampled at 44k, and audio sampled at 96k. I don't have
>> >any
>> >96k convertors, or I'd give it a shot myself. In all things audio, I'd
>> >trust
>> >this group's ears over
>> >m(any) others.
>> > If it is audible I'd propose three possibilities:
>> >-Our ears are much more sensitive than perviously thought or measured.
>> >(I'd
>> >tend to doubt this one...)
>> >-We do "hear" the higher frequencies, but with senses other than our
>> >ears.
>> > Perhaps our skin, or fine hair on the skin. Much like someone who is
>> >deaf
>> >"listens" to music, we are able to percieve the higher frequencies.
>> >or...
>> >-Its a sort of placebo effect. We think it's there, so it's there.
>> >Any thoughts???
>> >MR
>>
>
>DJ,

Are you sure they didn't mean 192kbps mp3 encoding vs 128kbps encoding?
That would make sense in the context.

And for DC: I think the lossless codecs (Apple's and FLAC for example) are

a good way to go for portables. I guess the problem is that a lot of consumers can't hear the difference between 192kbps mp3 or AAC in their environments...

And about those amp designers, what analog recording format (or more importantly, what consumer playback medium) in the past had response out to 250k?

Regardless, I think it's always going to be a battle where convenience wins out over fidelity in consumer audio. And as long as it sounds "good enough" to the consumer, that's a good thing for music when people want to listen and can do it where they like. It remains a part of their lives and thus lets us live ours.

;))

Regards,

Graham

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

>Yesterday I was doing some location work recording a panel discussion of
>some heavyweight film songwriters/scorers/producers and publishers who
>specialize in placing music with film editors and producers.

>
>The issue of higher sample rates and 5.1 mixing came up. The only place
>higher sample rates were preferred were for ftp'ing MP3's to the publisher
>for listening sessions prior to sending on the finished *stereo/44.1* final
>mixes subsequent to approval of the song. Seems that there is some voodoo
>that these folks think they are hearing when MP3's are upsampled to 192kHz.
>I've never done this so maybe there is some validity to it, but anyway,
they

>like having it done this way. As far as the final audio product that is
>heard in the film is concerned, 5.1 and higher sample rates aren't taking
>the world by storm.....not even a little.

>
>DeejOn Sun, 9 Oct 2005 17:26:28 -0600, "DJ"
<animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>In order for this to be really effective, you need to record nothing, copy
>this to an adjacent track, invert the phase and then do a bounce.

>
>;oP

>
Now, that be some well-crafted nothing!

yeah-- ChasThat brings back to mind my attempt to save a buck when I was about 16. This was about 1988, and I had myself a decent strat copy with at least one seymour suncan pickup and a nice neck, and had discovered the wonders od distortion via a cheap knock off of the Boxx DS1 I had, which was a PSK pedal from memory.

Not too shabby either. I wanted to move up to the world of delay, and of course all the talk was about digital delay, but such pedals went for \$250+ whereas my budget was only about \$120. I managed to find however an electronics shop which sold a digital delay kit for around that price. Suffice to say a week later all I had was a plastic box containing a bunch of (wrongly built) circuits which did nothing whatsoever, and \$120 had gone down the tube...

That may well have been my worst gear purchase ever when I think about it.

Cheers,
Kim.

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

>
>Seemed like the slutz were having some fun with that thread.
>
>
>What's your worst gear purchase?
>
>I'll go first.
>
>1969 My first electric guitar. Went to a thrift shop and there was a
>Jazzmaster that looked cool. Only 55.00! So, I sold a bunch of
>stuff and bought it. It needed a knob so I took it to the local
>Fender dealer and his service guy about fell off his c

Subject: Re: High Sampling Rates and Hearing
Posted by [Cujjo](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 02:42:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hair. It was
>a cheap knockoff (Fender decal and all) from the Phillipines!
>(evidently some of the servicemen buy them and bring them back)
>
>No truss rod, green wood in the neck, wavy plastic on the pickguard.
>
>Total POS. Worth nothing.
>
>ArrgGGGGGHHHHH...
>
>I'm 16 right, and know nothing about guitars, but I do know I am
>in a world of caca, and now I have no money.
>
>So, I go back to the thrift store, having cooked up a story about
>having sold something that wasn't mine and now I am in trouble, and
>the guy gave me my 55.00 back...
>

>Whew...

>

>Went and bought a real Fender (Jaguar this time) and finally got my
>heartbeat down to 195 or so....

>

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

>

>Seemed like the slutz were having some fun with that thread.

>

>

>What's your worst gear purchase?

>

>I'll go first.

>

>1969 My first electric guitar. Went to a thrift shop and there was a
>Jazzmaster that looked cool. Only 55.00!

A guitar was possibly my worst purchase too... only this one
was a real Fender - a 1972 Telecaster Deluxe. Bought in
like '80-'81 or so. What a POS!

I don't even know to describe the extent to what a POS it was
except to say it was a complete, total, and utter POS. Anyone
who owns one should burn it. Sacrifice it to the gods of shitty
guitars in hopes that someday they'll reward you with a Univox
Mosrite copy in return LOL!

Neili was lusting after a SG custom and finally got one. at the time it
cost me 1200.00 (around 1979) at Guitar Trader in Red Bank. i should
have know better when i couldn't tune it at the store. "oh, it only
needs a setup." yeah... 3 months later the neck separated at the
joint.

another one... i traded my 65 polar white, SG Jr. for a Larivee
"super strat." pointy headstock and all. was actually a very nice
guitar, neck through and all, but very 80's and ugh... when i think of
how nice that SG was. oh well.

:)

On 10 Oct 2005 10:44:09 +1000, "DC" <dc@spamviagra.com> wrote:

>

>Seemed like the slutz were having some fun with that thread.

>

>

>What's your worst gear purchase?

>

>I'll go first.

>
>1969 My first electric guitar. Went to a thrift shop and there was a
>Jazzmaster that looked cool. Only 55.00! So, I sold a bunch of
>stuff and bought it. It needed a knob so I took it to the local
>Fender dealer and his service guy about fell off his chair. It was
>a cheap knockoff (Fender decal and all) from the Phillipines!
>(evidently some of the servicemen buy them and bring them back)
>
>No truss rod, green wood in the neck, wavy plastic on the pickguard.
>
>Total POS. Worth nothing.
>
>ArrgGGGGGHHHHH...
>
>I'm 16 right, and know nothing about guitars, but I do know I am
>in a world of caca, and now I have no money.
>
>So, I go back to the thrift store, having cooked up a story about
>having sold something that wasn't mine and now I am in trouble, and
>the guy gave me my 55.00 back...
>
>Whew...
>
>Went and bought a real Fender (Jaguar this time) and finally got my
>heartbeat down to 195 or so....
>
>DCI have a couple of non working EDS cards (and no I did not burn them with
EDSTransfer string)
These have been bought as is for spare parts.
Because I am located in Greece it is cost prohibited to send cards aboard
for propable fix.
So with my audio engineer I could fix some here.
Would anybody kindly share these schematics ?
I know someone outhee got them...
The Ensoniq guy (I understand why) did not reply on this.
regards,
Dimitrios"Graham Duncan" <graham@grahamduncan.com> wrote:

>And about those amp designers, what analog recording format (or more importantly,
>what consumer playback medium) in the past had response out to 250k?

It wasn't the frequency response of the source material being that high,
it was the need for the amp circuitry to be able to go that
high so that the leading edge of transients would be reproduced
without any rounding off of the waveform. Deane Jensen wrote
a paper on this years ago. I'll see if I can find a copy of it.

DCD,

Long story short is that when Ensoniq was bought out by Emu and Creative, lots of heads rolled. A good deal of hostility ensued. Papers vanished, mysteriously, and *no one seems to know where they went*.. the why is obvious when you think about it from a creators standpoint. If there are indeed roadmaps on the EDS cards I would be most definitely interested should you come across them.. but I hold little hope at this late stage in the public release of those documents.

AA

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote in message news:434a13c0\$1@linux...

- > I have a couple of non working EDS cards (and no I did not burn them with
- > EDSTransfer string)
- > These have been bought as is for spare parts.
- > Because I am located in Greece it is cost prohibited to send cards aboard
- > for propable fix.
- > So with my audio engineer I could fix some here.
- > Would anybody kindly share these schematics ?
- > I know someone outhee got them...
- > The Ensoniq guy (I understand why) did not rep

Subject: Re: High Sampling Rates and Hearing

Posted by [Graham Duncan](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 04:53:33 GMT

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

ly on this.

- > regards,
- > Dimitrios

>

>Has to be the Roland tr707 drum box.

I could have bought a *lame sounding* 909 for a blowout price at the time, but noooo....

I wanted the latest and greatest.

And great it was, for about two months. I now use it's rimshot as a click soundsource when a drummer requires one.

I reckon the 909 still sounds lame, but hey, I could have made a truckload of money... if only.....

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

>

>Seemed like the slutz were having some fun with that thread.

>

>

>What's your worst gear purchase?
>
>I'll go first.
>
>1969 My first electric guitar. Went to a thrift shop and there was a
>Jazzmaster that looked cool. Only 55.00! So, I sold a bunch of
>stuff and bought it. It needed a knob so I took it to the local
>Fender dealer and his service guy about fell off his chair. It was
>a cheap knockoff (Fender decal and all) from the Phillipines!
>(evidently some of the servicemen buy them and bring them back)
>
>No truss rod, green wood in the neck, wavy plastic on the pickguard.
>
>Total POS. Worth nothing.
>
>ArrgGGGGGHHHHH...
>
>I'm 16 right, and know nothing about guitars, but I do know I am
>in a world of caca, and now I have no money.
>
>So, I go back to the thrift store, having cooked up a story about
>having sold something that wasn't mine and now I am in trouble, and
>the guy gave me my 55.00 back...
>
>Whew...
>
>Went and bought a real Fender (Jaguar this time) and finally got my
>heartbeat down to 195 or so....
>
>DCA thread about *nothing*

Who will watch it?

El Miguel

"Chas. Duncan" <dun

Subject: Re: High Sampling Rates and Hearing
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 07:37:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ple delay (Try this instead of AnalogX DX
plugin because you have the 64 plugin limit and with VST plugins NO LIMIT
Then put inside latency plugin 384 samples to the right.

Thus all processed tracks will be aligned to reverb return on tracks.

That is for now.

Please ask questions so I can see where I did my wrong homework...

Regards,

DimitriosHello DM (Scott)?

Chuck Duffy has moved on to other activities in the past year. Did you paid for the Brian Tankersley DVD and did not receive it? If so, start a new thread with that topic and maybe Aaron Allen can help out. AA was the videographer and spent a huge a

Subject: Re: High Sampling Rates and Hearing
Posted by [emarenot](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 14:41:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

.Might check Clarion too.
Heritage looks like no deductibles which is nice.

TIA,
Petel think this would have more to do with slew rate than frequency response..

David.

DC wrote:

> "Graham Duncan" <graham@grahamduncan.com> wrote:

>

>

>>And about those amp designers, what analog recording format (or more importantly, >>what consumer playback medium) in the past had response out to 250k?

>

>

>

> It wasn't the frequency response of the source material being that high,
> it was the need for the amp circuitry to be able to go that
> high so that the leading edge of transients would be reproduced
> without any rounding off of the waveform. Deane Jensen wrote
> a paper on this years ago. I'll see if I can find a copy of it.

>

>

> DC>13. FFX-4 also has a low 4096 samples latency for UAD plugz. If you think that is big note that FXpansion wrapper that you g

Subject: Re: High Sampling Rates and Hearing
Posted by [Chris Latham](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 15:24:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ly
> >VST
> >HINT: From inside Chainer you can use FFX-4 so have chainer to wrap DX
and
> >VST....
> >
> >13. FFX-4 also has a low 4096 samples latency for UAD plugz. If you think
> >that is big note that FXpansion wrapper that you guys were using gives
16384
> >samples of latency !!
> >
> >14. So you wrap senderella with Spinaudiolite.
> >
> >15. You put senderella on the audio tracks you wanna send to a reverb,
put
> >the send volume accordingly and redirect (full to the right) because
> >Spinaudio mixes two times the sound of the track)
> >
> >16. On audio tracks 15 and 16 you put two 16bit empty long files (5
minutes
> >or more,whatever)
> >17. On track 15 you open as STEREO the senderella again (spinaudiolite
> >wrapped) and put senderella as receiver .
> >Then on next native slot you open FFX-4 on track 15 as STEREO again.
> >
> >18. You open from inside FFX-4 a UAD1 reverb or any other DX reverb (like
> >DSPFX)
> >If you put UAD1 rvereb you get 4096 latency.

Subject: Re: High Sampling Rates and Hearing
Posted by [audioguy_nospam_](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 16:51:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

n my old G3 and have forgotten how the
installation process works. I still have my original order number, key number,
and response code, but are they still valid after all these years? And since
Paris is defunct, how and who would authorize the installation? Am I correct
in assuming that I need to connect a modem to the G4 for authorization through
the Internet or could I perform the authorization for my G4 through my old
G3 which does have a modem? (I have dial-up only.) And is there someone at
Ensoniq/E-Mu to perform the authorization or is it simply automated? Sorry
if I sound ridiculously stupid. Any help would be greatly appreciated.
--Richard.....which brings to mind the question, if Paris Hilton is screwing

someone in the woods and a tree falls on them, does it actually make a sound?

"Miguel Vigil" <

Subject: Re: High Sampling Rates and Hearing
Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 17:51:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

apper needs for senderella.

- >But for full use and potential senderella needs to be wrapped
- >
- >6. Wrappers that can be used are the FREE Spinaudio lite
- =
- > [http://www.spinaudio.com/downloads.php?download_type=3D3& ;download_id=3D3=](http://www.spinaudio.com/downloads.php?download_type=3D3&download_id=3D3)
- 3 which
- >can wrap ONLY one VST plugin.
- >So here you can wrap one instance of senderella and use it as send =
- for
- >reverbs.
- >If you buy Spinaudio ofcourse you can have as many plugins wrapped =
- as you
- >want.
- >
- >7.. Senderella by renaming its dll like send1,send2,send3 etc can =
- be used
- as
- >many times as you want it is that simple.
- >
- >8. you need to have 16bit files (empty) on the receining senderella
- >instances.
- >
- >9. If you have multiple cards then use (if you want it across =
- submixes)
- >tracks 15 and 16 of your last card, so that all sending instances =
- are bfore
