

---

Subject: Best \$29.95 I ever spent in my audio hobby  
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2004 13:59:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

13 back issues of the Audio critic. Accessible at: [www.theaudiocritic.com](http://www.theaudiocritic.com) If you are an audiophile, this is DEFINITELY, not probably, DEFINITELY, going to be the best \$29.95 you will spend. At last, I found a magazine that attempts to put some science into audio. Needless to say: highly recommended. I subscribed to stereophile for a year, and then cancelled my subscription there (they still keep sending me issues and I still keep trashing them), and then went in search of a magazine I liked. I now subscribe to a) the audiocritic (got the back issues first, and happily sent my forward subscription as well) and b) the sensible sound ([www.sensible-sound.com](http://www.sensible-sound.com)). REcommend both these mags, but again, the back issues of the audiocritic are MUST have items for any audiophile. Enjoy! -akhilesh

---

---

Subject: Re: Best \$29.95 I ever spent in my audio hobby  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 28 Sep 2004 14:53:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Ak; Only one caveat, The Sensibel Sound prints the same articles every month. J.R.

---

---

Subject: Re: Best \$29.95 I ever spent in my audio hobby  
Posted by [tom1356](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 04:05:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I just read their "10 biggest lies article" and if the rest of the magazine is similar you got ripped off.

---

---

Subject: Re: Best \$29.95 I ever spent in my audio hobby  
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 12:03:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That may be your opinion, Tom1356, and you are entitled to it. I disagree. I think it's the best \$29.95 I ever spent, and the best money any audiophile will ever spend. Just my opinion.  
:-)-akhilesh

---

---

Subject: Check this post out, it may give us more information

Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 12:26:22 GMT

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

---

<http://www.audioundtable.com/Tower/messages/236.html>

---

---

Subject: Re: Best \$29.95 I ever spent in my audio hobby

Posted by [tom1356](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 14:56:58 GMT

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

---

I'm glad you're happy with your purchase. If the article I read was true it would make things much easier. Unfortunately the article is very simplistic and dishonest. While I would never advocate spending a lot of money on cables, power conditioners, etc. There is no question that these things can improve the quality of an audio system. DIY is very inexpensive and can show you how things can change the sound. If you follow the advice in the article you will be perfectly happy with a Wave radio because that's as good as it gets.

---

---

Subject: Re: Check this post out, it may give us more information

Posted by [tom1356](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 15:17:07 GMT

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

---

Actually it just clouds the water. I have never used any of the products that Randi seeks to debunk. I don't know if they make any improvement or not. I would assume they don't, but I am skeptical by nature. You should be cautious with your money and generous with your experimentation.

---

---

Subject: Re: Best \$29.95 I ever spent in my audio hobby

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 16:29:58 GMT

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

---

As much as I like to give people the benefit of the doubt on audio, I must agree with Tom; this guy Aczel has all the credibility of O'Jay Simpson. The rest of the Audio world has disenfranchised him and his ideas long ago. His periodic resurfacing from the depths of ignorance occurs every new generation until they wise up to his attention seeking antics and disregard his ridiculous and childish self-promotion. Its the same old tired hackneyed flat-earth nonsense and by entertaining him we just waste opportunities to progress in this field. There are lots of those old germanium transistor recievers out there, the Japanese dumped them on us with the fallacy of

Vanishing Total Harmonic Distortion while they bought up all those great sounding old tube amps from Fisher, and Scott and Harmon Kardon etc. Isn't it odd that years ago it was common to see a nice old console tube stereo with built in Turntable in the homes of your parents and neighbors. And to hear them being actually played on a regular basis in all those homes. Then right about the mid-seventies all of a sudden, POOF, everyone ran out and bought one of them thar new fangled transistor units, no distortion! Too bad as soon as you turned them up past go your ears would bleed. Funny how now most people don't even own a stereo, or they have a wave unit whatever that thing is. Gee, what happened? Who needs an instant replay of Julian Hirsch; you can have it. I'll take music instead.

---

---

Subject: I disagree with your conclusions  
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 18:18:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Tom, I disagree with your conclusions re: that the logical conclusion is that a wave radio is as good as it gets. I like both magazines: the sensible sound and especially the audio critic, because they (esp the audio critic) try to be scientific in their approach to what sounds good and what does not. imho, there is a serious lack of anything remotely scientific in our hobby. Most of the letters praising Audio critic are from professionals & scientists. I would simply say to everyone: spend the \$29.95. You'll get 13 issues of a magazine that reviews hardware and writes about music. At the very least, you can see what many in the high end audio business are trying to make darn sure you do not see (not that i think the posters here are in that category of course). Anyways, all i can do is recommend. It's up to others to take or disregard that. :-)-akhilesh

---

---

Subject: Re: Check this post out, it may give us more information  
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 18:20:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thanks for the advice, Tom. Randi is the guy who debunked Uri Geller, and has a standing prize for UFO spotters/psychics, etc to prove their abilities or sightings. He is quite well known as a rationalist. Also, thanks for the note on being frugal with money....i am! Hence my recommendation to spend \$29.95 on 13 back issues of a magazine that usually subscribes for \$6 an issue or \$8 cover (the audio critic: accessible at [www.theaudiocritic.com](http://www.theaudiocritic.com)) thanx-akhilesh

---

---

Subject: My impressions of Peter Aczel, and his magazine are quite the opposite  
Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 18:23:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think his approach is scientific, and i LOVE the content of the back issues of the audio critic. You are right, John, a lot of the audio community do not like him at all. I beg to differ though, on this one. I think he is great! PLus for \$29.95, how can anyone lose? My advice, again: Get the 13 issues and read for yourself. -akhilesh

---

---

Subject: Re: I disagree with your conclusions  
Posted by [tom1356](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 18:36:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I agree with you that \$30 is not a lot to spend for an education. Free is a lot less. The free article they have on their site is full of lies. They hold it up as an example of their magazine. All I can assume is that the magazines are full of lies also, bargains though they may be.

---

---

Subject: Re: My impressions of Peter Aczel, and his magazine are quite the opposite  
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 19:15:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You are Always a gentleman my friend. We agree to disagree.. As far as the 30\$ I read all his stuff the first time around back in the early 80's. Same old same old.

---

---

Subject: Re: I disagree with your conclusions  
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 22:59:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh, I don't know guys. I can see that the editor is a controversial personality, and there's probably a whole lot more than I'm privy to. We had a discussion about this earlier, and I could see that Aczel was a hotbutton topic. So I realized there was probably a lot of history there. All I know is that I scanned through an Audio Critic magazine about loudspeakers, and the articles in it were written by guys like Floyd E. Toole and Don Keele. As you might imagine, their articles were technical, scientifically based and accurate. I suppose there must have been some really controversial statements made in other issues of the magazine. But this one looked great to me, with what I thought were good articles written by industry heavyweights.

---

---

Subject: Re: I disagree with your conclusions

---

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 30 Sep 2004 23:11:53 GMT

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

---

If he is so famous how come we never heard of him? Hah? All I can say is with a name like Floyd Toole he better be famous.(comic relief)

---

---

Subject: Dr. Floyd E. Toole

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Fri, 01 Oct 2004 00:27:04 GMT

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

---

Dr. Floyd E. Toole at the 109th AES convention.Dr. Floyd E. Toole is the Vice President Acoustical Engineering of Harman International Industries, Inc. I've included a few links to his whitepapers and stuff, just for fun. I think he is an interesting guy, and you can read these articles without a magazine subscription. Floyd E. Toole backgroundFloyd E Toole interview, by Per Arne AlmfloWhitepaper: Loudspeakers and Rooms for Multichannel Audio Reproduction, Part 1Whitepaper: Loudspeakers and Rooms for Multichannel Audio Reproduction, Part 2Whitepaper: Loudspeakers and Rooms for Multichannel Audio Reproduction, Part 3Whitepaper: The Acoustical Design of Home TheatersWhitepaper: Audio - Science in the Service of ArtWhitepaper: How Many Channels Do We Need To Believe That We Are "There"?

---

---

Subject: Re: Dr. Floyd E. Toole

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 01 Oct 2004 00:53:36 GMT

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

---

Thanks Wayne; your the best!

---

---

Subject: Re: Dr. Floyd E. Toole

Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Fri, 01 Oct 2004 02:44:16 GMT

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

---

Nice Link, Wayne! Thanks.-akhilesh

---

---

Subject: Re: My impressions of Peter Aczel, and his magazine are quite the opposite

---

Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Fri, 01 Oct 2004 02:45:46 GMT

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

---

John, I feel the same way about you. WE can have our small disagreements, and still be united in this awesome hobby! Have a good evening, and happy listening, sir!-akhilesh

---

---

Subject: Re: Dr. Floyd E. Toole

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 01 Oct 2004 16:49:46 GMT

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

---

Wayne Thanks again for those papers. Science in the Service of Art. Nice reading; nothing really new or to disagree with. The anecdotal description of the listening tests; while entertaining, have no real value w/o knowing the size of the statistical sample, of whom that sample is composed, and what other subliminal cues have been detected and neutralised. I know he takes a stab at doing just that and he states unequivocally that this is not a rigidly controlled scientific example. However it does postulate scientifically derived conclusions and as such requires some rigor. This is hard to debate because there are emotions and personal allegiances involved. Maybe that is the real subjective/objective conundrum. To be truly objective, you would have to be anonymous, and self-funded. None of those around. I will say this, it's a better debate than that travesty we were subjected to on Thursday night at 9pm EST. Jeez, what an embarrassment! To be continued.

---