

Re: logical paradoxes

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-08/2749.html>

From: Kenneth Doyle (*nobody_at_notmail.com*)

Date: 08/22/04

Date: Sun, 22 Aug 2004 02:03:55 GMT

"Acme Diagnostics" <LFinezaphthis@partpostmark.net> wrote in news:41263f26\$0\$90170\$45beb828@newscene.com:

>
> *Kenneth Doyle <nobody@notmail.com> wrote:*
>> *"Acme Diagnostics" <LFinezaphthis@partpostmark.net> wrote in*
>>> *Kenneth Doyle <nobody@notmail.com> wrote:*
>>>
>>>> *...it's easier to deal with signal distortion in digital circuits.*
>>>>
>>>> *analog computers sort-of (music keyboards) is any guide, there's*
>>>> *also a big reliability problem.*
>>>>
>>>> *I started out in the music industry.*
>>>>
>>>> *Like 90% of programmers, it seems. Make that "independent"*
>>>> *programmers. <g>*

heh! I'm you're original self-taught computer cowboy.

>> *After a few years of being a rock 'n'*
>> *roll drummer, I started up a little recording studio. It was almost*
>> *totally analogue except for one of the first digital delay units. A*
>> *Delta Labs Effectron: -)*
>>
>> *I had a Teac 4-track with a bunch of other shiney boxes. Nothing to*
>> *shout about, and nowhere near what it seems you had, or what you*
>> *can do with a cheapy Korg sequencer today.*

My studio was only an 8 track. In 1982, that was a fairly respectable pre-production rig. I did a couple of years' apprenticeship in a 24 track studio. That's where I learned all my esoteric but now redundant knowledge. For example, did you know that we always stored our tapes with the tail out? That minimises magnetic print-through, from one layer of tape to the next. If you store the tape tail out, the print-through makes a softer post-echo, which is virtually inaudable. If you store it head out, the print-through makes a louder pre-echo.

[big snip]

>> *My theory is that electronic keyboards sounded better as the human
>> interface improved. Velocity sensitive logic circuitry (along with
>> nicely weighted keys) enabled the electronics to more closely
>> reproduce what the user was doing.*
>
> *I disagree, I think, sort of. There, you're talking about performance,
> not programming a sequencer.*

Right, but that's my point. In the early days, you had to programme the amplitude envelope. Once the envelope is programmed there are no subtle changes that normally result from playing an instrument differently. On a real piano, for example, the attack, decay, sustain and release are altered by how hard you hit a key and when you release it. These days, with velocity sensitive keyboards, the envelope is 'programmable' to some degree as part of the performance, just like on a real instrument. Then you have technology like breath controllers, which let you 'programme' the envelope to mimic a wind instrument. The envelope of an instrument is just as important as it's waveform, when it comes to the ear's ability to distinguish one instrument from another. For example, if you crop the first X milliseconds from the start of a note from both a guitar and a piano, you can't tell them apart anymore (where X is the the attack + decay portion of the envelope). I'm probably exaggerating to make my point here.

> *Keyboard performers, especially purists
> like myself (and who isn't), have a different notion of keyboards. A
> piano player might like the action, but would much prefer a piano. The
> boss keyboard is the Hammond B3 (still), no touch sensitivity, etc. A
> purist doesn't want to sound like something, s/he wants to be that
> something. It's great to sound like a real sax when performing,
> everybody gets a kick out of that, but what's going on in the
> keyboardist's mind is "Feelings, wo wo wo feelings." I think you're
> speaking about non-keyboardists using keyboards, but I don't see how
> that applies.*

The weighted keys were a secondary consideration. When you want to perform a piece that sounds like it's being played on a piano and you can only choose from two synthesisers, one with a nice piano like action and one without, which one would you choose? I suspect that the feel of the action is more responsible for the eventual sound of a performance than is thought. I'm not talking about the sound of just one note in isolation and whether or not that one note sounds like a piano. It's more to do with the overall impression of a passage of music.

> *You can hunt and pick, but in the end it shows. Well,
> then there's "smooth jazz." <g> I think, they would use programming
> instead, but you tell me. This is no music slam. You said you were a
> drummer. Drums are the most important instrument in the band, and I've
> not found one old-timer yet who disagrees with that. (Bass player
> second.)*

>

- > *If you disagree, that's fine, tell me what you think. Some of the*
- > *audience might not know that performance musicians disagree in a*
- > *different way than most others on Usenet, as I notice in the music*
- > *performance groups. Much more respectful.*

heh! We've learned that we need each other to make music (even in the latter days of the orchestra in a box).

But I have to agree, the rhythm section is the most important thing to get right in a studio, for example.

- > *Larry, not so worried about being off–topic when 90% of posts are*
- > *off–topic anyway, just one more subtle impact of a major troll,*
- > *another being when relatively sane regs start snipping at each other*
- > *over the troll (a milestone for the troll), another being that*
- > *paranoia permeates the group and affects totally unrelated threads.*
- >

I'm sure sci.logic can stand a little off–topic chatter. After all, it's not like we're just repeating the same things to each other, over and over again.

--

CodeCutter - good, fast and cheap; pick two.