
Subject: Re: Thought experiment & why sonic indistinguishability is not a bad thing
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 11 Jan 2006 18:10:58 GMT

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

I agree with the analysis and understand the position that our measurement devices will accurately describe those aspects of a signal they define . It's just that if we know anything in science it is that we don't know everything. So yes; since it cannot at this time with our capabilities be described then you could say it lies within the realm of philosophy. Until that day comes when something new is discovered and the concepts revert back to the world of science.I think our instruments are still rather crude; think of all the ways the brain can distinguish sensory phenomena more delicate than any device can. There must be a reason some SS sounds different than other SS stuff does. The second mandate is this; if tubes sound more like music how can they be altering the signal to make the sound less like music??. It's a total contradiction of logic. Thats the part no one seems able to explain to any real satisfaction. I don't contradict anyother point of veiw here; this is my inability to rationalise the argument. I seek to take the impressions of sound out of the restrictions created by a sense of expectation that typically would accompany any test conducted by people in the hobby who have pre-conceived expectations. Thats why I suggested using neophyte's who are familiar with music and musical instrumentation. A stradivarious plays the same frequencies that a cheap violin plays; so how come all agree it sounds better? Every component measureable by instruments is there in both examples; but one sounds better...why?
