

Re: Tube amps,,,days are numbered ?

Re: Tube amps,,,days are numbered ?

Source: <http://newsgroups.derkeiler.com/Archive/Alt/alt.guitar.amps/2007-03/msg00334.html>

- *From:* "Xtrchessreal" <XtrChessreal@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 5 Mar 2007 03:06:49 -0800
-

On Mar 3, 7:09 am, teemukytt...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

I'll add your to the list that has grown it's the that prediction was hatched.

Let's see..... That makes you #3,847,962,634 who have been to the sand
caster's psychic digital
hot line.

Well you can add me too... ;-)

it's cheaper to just buy the God Damn Tube amp compared to all the wasted
money getting
sand to equal the sound of tubes!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

LOL. I wouldn't say so. It's cheaper to buy a 200\$ FX unit that can do
10 decent tones than buy ten decent tube amps. Ain't no way around it.

Personally, I did like the "raw" tones on the concerned website but
hated the fact that they were ruined by overdoing the FX. Also, ain't
no way a cabinet simulator + reverb can replace a decent cabinet in
decent acoustic space, miked decently – and THIS you can hear in the
clips – not inferiority to real "tube tones". There is no sign of
horrible "digital" tones prominent to "ancient" 8bit 20kHz soundcards
that had cheap DACs and ADCs but overdoing those effects makes the
clips sound just like one can expect an average factory preset of
digital pedals to sound: Boring. No way one could use those tones when
playing together with a band – no way one would even want to do that:
They do not blend in. This had nothing to do with the tone. Give that
unit to a good musician with a decent, transparent SS amp and a good
guitar cabinet and guitar and he/she will rock. In the demo song by
Adam Cook the FX were at least blended to the arrangement but
unfortunately the backing band sounded like average, boring studio
band one can hear in the soundtracks of porno movies so the song
failed to impress me. Sounds were pretty ok; they would have been

Re: Tube amps,,,days are numbered ?

better if they had miked the guitar gear.

I guess everyone can argue, for example, if an emulation of JCM800 sounds exactly like a true JCM800. Since most FX units are designed to provide a multitude of emulations + echo/reverb efx etc. they are built modularly – which in turn means that they are compromises between realism and size of source code/circuit. Want a decent emulation of an individual piece of gear; that would likely require one individual unit dedicated for the purpose and markets define that no-one is going to buy that. I'd like to hear/see tubes modeling amps like Lab Series or JC-120 – then I could laugh how "far off" they are. I'd like to see a tube unit that provides various reverb, echo, chorus, compression, distortion and EQ setups together with a graphical interface and weights less than 1 kg.

With SS, there is also the inherent problem relating to nonlinearity in frequency response of hearing – this another BIG issue often overlooked in the whole tubes vs. ss debate: All those effect patches will sound completely different with different volume levels; if you tweak up an effect to sound good at low volume levels it sounds like crap on higher. This is often regarded as a fault of SS but, on a contrary, this is actually a "human error" – similarly as a tube amp distortion is NONEXISTENT unless you crank the circuit. Lesson here is: One has to deal differently with SS stuff and tube stuff but that doesnt make other any inferior to other. I'm sick and tired of people feeding that lie.

When somebody comes up with reincarnated tones that actually sound like Jimi, Stevie, Jimmy,...etc I'll believe. But that's like asking some omnipotent being to show up and claim existence. You'd be better off looking to the 8-Ball, "Indications point to no!" It just ain't gonna happen.

X

.