Subject: Here is the post
Posted by akhilesh on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 13:31:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There was no "review" in the usual sense of the word. Only the design specifications were actually discussed. The closest thing to what most people would call a review was the concluding statement which I have copied since the issue in question is no longer available."In view of our role as godfather to the [speaker]...we've decided not to review it here in the subjective sense. The objectively verifiable design data presented should be sufficient. It's large-signal bass response alone, not to mention its time-domain characteristics make the usual comparisons unnecessary."Next is a statement admitting that they are using it as one of several speaker references, but they advise that if anyone is really interested they should go hear it themselves when it becomes available.The magazine did, in their "reference" advice section, state that the Quad/Janus speaker combination was better sounding than the Fourier prototype design; an odd thing for Aczel to say if he was somehow looking to be untruthful about the speaker.As far as being some ethical violation, I would concur if the magazine had not come out and stated up front what they were doing. I find it no different than when Brock Yates had his creation recently featured in Car and Driver, the magazine he writes for. The article stated up front that the car was a project which might be manufactured for resale, and then it was put through the paces.Ethical violations happen when people are not honest about their intentions. Now, you may not like what Mr. Aczel prints, but I don't think he was ever not open regarding the speaker. When I first read the piece (many years ago) my thought was, so what? I knew that the market would sort all this out and that it would be pretty clear soon enough regarding his conclusions about the goodness of the speaker.Can be found at:http://www.audioasylum.com/forums/critics/messages/5094.html