
Subject: Re: Digital Compromised
Posted by [GarMan](#) on Tue, 08 Mar 2005 18:28:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Digital and analogue sources are different. No doubt about that. I think both have their strengths and weakness. I'm just wondering if in the past 20 years, as digital source established itself as the mainstream standard, if manufacturers have redesigned amps and speakers (consciously or unconsciously) to better match the medium. For example, output from CDP's can easily be in the 2V range. So, why are preamp/amps still designed with such high gain that clipping occurs with only milli-volts? Is today's preference for soft dome tweeters over metal domed tweeters driven by the introduction of digital source (ie "brittle" HF), or just coincidence? On the photo front, I've always considered myself "anti-digital." In the past three years, I've been shooting primarily B&W, I process my own film, and do my own printing. 35mm, but sometimes 4x6 when I can get my hands on a view camera from my courses. Most prints are 8x10, with about a third at 11x14 or 16x20. I never believed that you can get the same level of quality from digital as you can from film in a 16x20 print, especially one that's shot on a 4x6 negative. I still don't think you can. But you can't deny the convenience and consistency of digital. It's also next to impossible now to get a gig if you're still only using film. Gar.
