



THIRD EAR ENTERPRISES (PTY) LTD.

Postal:
P.O. Box 11460
JOHANNESBURG 200
SOUTH AFRICA
DAVIES MARSHES
Tel. (011) 309-1626

THE ENJOYMENT OF RECORDED MUSIC IN A
TECHNOLOGICALLY ORIENTED SOCIETY

THE FUTURE OF MUSIC ON RECORDINGS

IN A
TECHNICALLY ORIENTED SOCIETY

(C) 1983 by Stephen F. Temmer

I have been in broadcasting, recording, and audio equipment since 1943. I guess that gives me some long-term overview of our field and perhaps even the right to talk about it. I am greatly troubled these days about what I perceive to be a self-destructive path along which the recording industry appears to be moving. And I'd like to talk to you about it, since all of our professional future depends upon it.

First permit me to make a very important statement: "The actual name of our field of endeavor is MUSIC. It isn't tape, it isn't disk, it isn't cassette -- it's MUSIC." It should therefore come as no surprise to you that my interest in engineering is an interest only in a means to an end. We all sometimes get carried away a bit with the many fascinating "toys" which our industry produces, and it is at times such as those that we tend to forget what all these "toys" represent. Oh, I forgot to tell you: I was really trained as a musician. I spent my youth as a Vienna Choir Boy, I studied violin, piano, organ and composition, and until I was fifteen years old never even thought about anything technical. That came much later. My interest in engineering is solely tied to my enjoyment of music and my interest in disseminating music in its most enjoyable - not necessarily playful - form.

As a technical person I have lived through many "revolutions" in our field: the start of tape recording; the start of television; the start of Vinyl to replace shellac as a pressing material; the start of long playing records; the start of stereo disks; the false start of quadraphonics; the start of digital audio; the start of videodisks and the start of multi-track recording of popular music. Anyone who has witnessed this many "starts", must become accustomed to the pattern of "starts".

One thing is interesting to this observer: these "starts" keep getting more frequent and less revolutionary as we go along. I ask myself quite often why this is, and I believe I have an answer. There is a limit on the number of innovations which can dramatically alter our perception of music. Stereo was one such innovation. But the next step: from 2-channel to 4-channel, brought much less dramatic an effect than that first step from 1-channel to stereo. In other words, we are running out of new ways in which to enhance music. And only those inventions which serve the enhancement of music are ultimately successful.

Let's talk about human hearing a bit. One thing is clear: we don't know a great deal about psychoacoustics. What we do know is from relatively recent research, and much of that is suspect. I believe we will never really get as good a grasp of our hearing as we have of our sight. The ears appear to be much more educatable, much more adaptable than are the eyes. Or is it perhaps our brain which, stimulated by our aural organs, responds in very subjective ways -- ways which, like all subjective responses, change with time, experience and environment. We have always made very definitive statements about our hearing. This writer has always felt that such a rigid approach is much too risky. For every definitive statement which I heard 30 years ago, I have heard retractions not long after. One only has to read reviews of records made in the early twenties, using such terms as "totally natural", "indistinguishable from the live performance", "never to be surpassed quality", to know how prone we are to exaggerate when it comes to describing our aural perceptions. Caution is most definitely to be recommended!

I am sure you have often heard the statement that dogs can hear higher frequencies than humans. How do we know that? We don't even know what we hear, much less what dogs hear. It is true that dogs respond to higher frequencies than humans do, but "respond" is not the same as "hear". All of our psychoacoustic testing is based on "response", in other words on the interconnection in our brain between the sensation of hearing (input), and our verbalizing of our reaction to that input (output). I am unwilling to admit that there is a perfect communications channel between that input and that output. I rather suspect that there are many blockages in the way: blockages which have to do with prejudice, conditioning, wishful thinking, social amenities, etc. etc.

In my collection there are many recordings of the 40's and 50's in mono. Such gems as Toscanini, Bruno Walter, Jussi Björling, Kirsten Flagstad, etc. Great experiences in music, all of them in mono, many with restricted response range and noisy background, YET in many respects more musically satisfying than much of what passes for "state of the art" today. Why is that? Perhaps the answer may be found in the fact that the engineers in the control rooms of those days, unencumbered by so sophisticated an arsenal of electronic equipment, were able to devote their full attention to the judgement of that which is of paramount importance: the MUSIC. Producers were schooled and knowledgeable, empowered to make decisions on the spot, relying solely on their own taste to help them to make those decisions which then led to a completed recording when the musicians left the studio. Today, by contrast, that task seems to go on endlessly, in a vain effort at "refining", "perfecting", "polishing". Much of the human quality which stems from the instinctive reaction tempered by knowledge, is lost in this process of filtering. How often do I remember recording twenty or more "takes" of a song, a solo, an entire piece, only to end up using the very first (imperfect?) one in the end, because it conveyed the most spontaneous human output. One wonders whether the quest for perfection represented by days and weeks of retakes and mix-downs, the many tracks made by musicians who never even meet in the studio, really contribute to the musical experience. It is something to think about.

Presented at
1984 Australian
Regional Convention

...ask about the future of music in its recorded form. In a digital world of audio...
...the first European AES convention in Cologne, which introduced the
DELTA-T or Digital Auto Delay... it was an interesting success...
question, the ability to thread up... of billions of years... pieces of music
is a breathtaking technical word... but does it really... our enjoyment of music?
question that.

It surely "facilitates" many... processes in the production of recorded music. It takes such
production, more convenient, more precise, less subject to deterioration in quality. But are not
these advantages directed more towards suiting the convenience of the industry, rather than
improving the transmission of music? Some say these two concepts are one and the same. But
is that strictly true? Does it not rather license greater excesses in the processing of music,
excesses which really do not improve music? We seem never to look back. We take those steps
we feel bring us advantages. Ten years later come to realize that it has led us astray. What
do we do then? Rather than to go back to the decision point where we took the wrong path,
we try to retrieve the situation by adding yet another process, when in fact that next step
introduces yet another... in this vicious circle.

There still is nothing better than a direct recording made with a minimum number of high
quality microphones on a well-maintained professional recorder -- first generation. It has always
been that way. Digital techniques make possible the retention of those numerous (unnecessary?)
processing steps which supposedly help to "refine" the musical experience.

There is an attempt at an analogy between motion pictures and TV on the one hand and audio
on the other. But as I had pointed out earlier, such comparisons must be looked upon with much
skepticism! It is true that our eyes perceive 24 still pictures, each flashed twice onto a screen
each second, as a "moving picture". The same holds true for 30 pictures (25 in 50 Hz countries),
each scanned twice each second as "motion" on our TV set. We realize that these are all still
pictures, and yet we see them move. We do know some effects which dramatically show us that
they are not true moving pictures. The wagon wheels in those Westerns which appear to go
backwards, drive home the limits of this technology, but we've gotten used to it.

Will we ever get used to the "backwards turning wagon wheel," which are to be found in digital
audio. The assumption that between 32,000 and 48,000 "still sounds" per second will blend, will
melt into an analog sound, has as yet to be tested over time. The 15 kHz complex waveform
which is reproduced from the digital encoding format with but two samples must be "heard" by
the brain when its verbalized output response today indicates that it "can't hear that". Time
will tell.

RECORDING FORMATS FOR THE FUTURE

We have enjoyed record, flat disks for almost 100 years. We have had the ability to carry music
around with us in our cars, on the beach, and tied to our belt for roughly 30 years by means
of cassettes. One of these two formats appears to satisfy each of our needs: one that's quite
large size with instant access to any spot on it, for the home, and one that is handy for
portable/mobile applications. Now we are told by the hardware people that we must change to
newer technology: digital encoding and a laser for playback. It sounds like the future holds
much excitement for all of us, especially when we address the playful aspects of our nature.
But are we prepared to pay the price for these new toys? Do we have to pay that price? Again
the hungry hardware industry says an emphatic YES! But, we say, music is for everyone, and
not everyone is rich. Music finds its largest audience when the cost of bringing it to us is
lowest. There is no doubt that the largely amortized plant equipment which produces disks
will yield the most reasonably priced music. Even cassettes are somewhat more expensive (at
the same quality level) than disk, but also by now largely amortized. So why should we
change?

We are told that the quality of the pressed analog disk is insufficient for our enjoyment of
music. We are told that ticks and pops surely destroy our enjoyment. I claim that the high
price of the new digital technology will do that much more effectively! We have only just begun
to explore the quality limits in disk recording technology. Look at the emerging DMM (Direct
Metal Mastering) technique which, while lowering noise and virtually eliminating those annoying
ticks, does so at reduced cost!! That's what we need: more music at a lower price.

The CD (Compact Disk) will cost a fortune, supposedly "automate" our enjoyment of music,
never wear out, sound perfect -- and cost less than the LP does now. It appears, however,
that the PCM recorded compact cassette is also about to burst upon the scene. And once it
does, it appears that this already familiar format should catch on more quickly. But then what
about digital technology on a large size disk? That too is available. We only have to utilize
the existing harddisk formats, notably the CED Videodisc from RCA, as a storage means, and
we are back to the familiar two formats: 12" disk and cassette, our two old friends.

There is a "fairy tale" which is rampant in the industry. That's the thought that it would be
lovely to have all nine Beethoven symphonies on one tiny digital disk. That fallacy is based on
the consumer's uneducated belief that it is the price of the pressing which makes the record
so expensive. But we all know that of the \$ 7.00 or so we pay for an LP, the actual pressing
cost is something like \$ 0.55, while the four-color album cover cost almost twice that much!
What is expensive about a record is the music itself, and the well deserved royalties paid to
composers, artists, publishers and the record company itself. Even if the pressing were free,
that would hardly influence the selling price of the product. So a fifty cent pressing which has
on it every song the Beatles ever wrote would cost just as much as the entire collection of
traditional LP's it took to record them originally.

CONCLUSION

In the technological age of communications in which we find ourselves it is easy to confuse the
medium with the message (1). The message is MUSIC. The medium is immaterial as long as
it serves to bring the message to the maximum number of people at the minimum price! Let's
all work on that aspect of the message rather than expecting the consumer to assume the
additional costs of financing the industry's hobbies.

(1) Marshall McCluen, Toronto, Canada.

October 1983

The above Preprint previously appeared in "Radio and Electronics" magazine
and the Peoples Review and News Bulletin for which it was specifically written.

All rights reserved. Reproduction of this preprint, or any
portion thereof, is not permitted without direct permission
from the Journal of the Audio Engineering Society.

Stephen F. Tommer,
President, The Gotham Organisation
New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

This preprint has been reproduced from the author's advance
manuscript, without editing, corrections or consideration by
the Review Board. The AES takes no responsibility for the
contents.

Additional preprints may be obtained by sending request
and remittance to the Audio Engineering Society, 60 East
42nd Street, New York, New York 10165 USA.