
Subject: Re: OT: UAD Multiband.....ROCKS!
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 07 Mar 2006 06:07:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

/>
>>
>>Muse Receptor.

- Paul Artola
Ellicott City, Maryland

On Tue, 11 Apr 2006 11:39:18 -0600, EK Sound <askme@nospam.com> wrote:

>Hi all,
>
>A buddy of mine wants to build a soft-synth computer for live use
>(WinXP). I am looking for MB/CPU recommendations for this. I NEED
>this MB to have a minimum of 2 PCIx slots for existing hardware.
>On-board video is actually preferred in this instance.
>
>Thanks for any recommendations!
>
>David.I sold my PT rig when I switched to Paris. I did it at the time primarily
for the sound of the Paris mix bus. This was before HD.

When HD was released, the distinction was far less obvious. HD still sounds different from Paris but not awful anymore, just different. Paris still has more of an analog/tape sound plus the added benefit of sounding more aggressive when you push the gain stages.

So now the big question! Do I prefer the sound of Paris over other DAWS because its actually makes better sounding recordings, or is it because it is closer to the sound I associate with my favorite albums from the last 30 years?

I think the truth is closer to the second, and I think this is largely a learned behavior, empirical rather than based on any truth.

In a recent session at another producer's studio (who will remain unnamed), I listened to some pop-rock mixes done on a Paris rig. The sound was big and clear and sounded very tape-like. Overall it sounded quite good and not at all wimpy. The artist however hated the sound. He played us a number of recent albums known to have been recorded in PT or similar sounding DAWS as examples of what he wanted. This is the sound he knows an

Subject: OT: UAD Multiband.....ROCKS!

Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Tue, 07 Mar 2006 06:59:27 GMT

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

submixes from any one MEC. You could record 128 channels simultaneously (I know this has been done at least by two people that frequented this group) but it would require 8 EDS cards and 8 MEC's each loaded with 16 channels of expansion input.

David.

Steve Cox wrote:

> Is an MEC only capable of sending 16 channels, regardless of how many Adat
> optical cards it has?
> Steve
>
> "Steve Cox" <stevec1@charter.net> wrote:
>
>>Ahhh, So the trick is a second MEC to the second card? If I have 3 cards,
>>how does this show up in the busses? I take it if a card has an MEC on it
>>It will record?
>>So here's a given scenari

Subject: Re: OT: UAD Multiband.....ROCKS!

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 07 Mar 2006 12:30:07 GMT

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

on, I will continue to use Paris, but just as I have made decisions

> in the past to use SSL consoles rather than Neves to achieve a more trendy
> "Pop" mix, I am now experimenting with ways to capture the "elusive PT
sound".

> (Insert appropriate emoticon).

>

> Luckily it was reasonably easy to achieve. I recently purchased the Waves
> SSL bundle and running that in Logic can get me very close to the sound of
> better sounding PT mixes. So I can still use Paris whenever I like and I
> can experiment with a mix of the two styles.

>

> What does all this mean? Nothing other then I understand why some people
> may prefer the way other systems sound and I think that my own preferences
> are biased by many years of listening to records made the old way. I don't
> see giving up Paris any time soon but I also don't think it's worth
fighting

> over if someone else has different opinions on what sounds good.

>

> And don't forget the cyclical nature of fashion almost guarantees that one
> day we will once again be "in".
>
> Gene Not sure if it matters, but I don't really need to bnc the 2 mecs together
do I? as I use a master word clock. The Aardsync. 4 word clock sends, I have
everything set to 44.1 And I use a Ramsa DA7 motorized fader digital console
for input, also set for 44.1

"Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote:

> Don't do as I say, do as I think! ;-)

>

> David.

>

> Kim wrote:

>

>> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote:

>>

>>> one connected to Card A (default

>>> master) and as Tom mentioned, one MEC connected to the *last

>>> EDS card*

>>

>>

>> You should also note that "last EDS card" refers to "whichever card has
the

>> last designation". It does not refer to anything to do with their physical

>> location in your machine. Which one is last in a given machine with a
given

>> OS is almost impossible to predict. You will have to experiment to work
it

>> out.

>>

>> But the interfaces need to be on card A and card C in your case, as decided
>> by the Paris software.

>>

>> Cheers,

>> Kim. With the exception of a few occasional rough spots h
