
Subject: Tangential digression, flame shield engaged.
Posted by [mikebake](#) on Sun, 18 Aug 2002 13:11:39 GMT

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

Nah, never went away from them! Actually, my personal crusade is for active crossovers; how we put up with the degradation the passive units give us when we chase all kinds of other marginal improvements is beyond me, especially when such a good solution exists. That the active unit is demonstrably superior is not a question, the question is, why don't more guys go after it? I have read repeatedly that the crossover introduces more problems than anything else in the chain, and always represents a set of compromises. Why endure it? Sure, I've heard great music from speakers using passives, but I believe, as do some others, that the benefit of the active crossover is one of the more dramatic, quick improvements you can make. I also prefer the superior motor control of the SS units, as well as the headroom. Give me motor control or give me Bose! Anyway, how's that for a tangent? I really think more people should be going this way. There is a reason pro audio went this way long ago, and it wasn't just power handling issues. The more you look at it, the more you think you oughta deal with dividing the bandwidth BEFORE the amps, not after. Nothing else makes as much sense. And given the level of hobby activity (\$) many of us have invested, an extra amp and crossover ain't much. I post this on this forum because I tend to think that rationality and non-knee-jerk reactions are more the norm here. Plus no Romy. I also bristled at an audio asylum member's comment awhile ago about "op-amps" and how some "golden ears" (he wouldn't assert that they were HIS ears) said they did terrible things to sound. Talk about your unsubstantiated, non-scientific crap. I asked him who these golden ears were, but of course got no response. So my motto is "DOWN WITH PASSIVE, GO ACTIVE, YOUNG MAN"!
