
Subject: Is stereo a misunderstood logic?
Posted by [drake](#) on Sun, 31 Jul 2016 15:14:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I came across an article here because stereo is one phenomenon that I have not yet grasped very well. Do you agree with the argument that people are wrong in assuming that adding stereophonic sound-reproduction perfects monophonic recording?

Subject: Re: Is stereo a misunderstood logic?
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 01 Aug 2016 04:37:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The article lists some very valid arguments, but those (and many others) have been discussed ad-nauseum for decades, quite literally. But the point that no sound source is stereo - all natural sounds are point sources - is well understood. You cannot recreate the natural imaging with stereo and, in fact, it creates problems with monaural sound because of comb filtering.

What stereo does is to allow a good illusion to be created. That's the point. Same could be said of multi-channel sound: Even five or seven channels isn't enough to create a true representation of the localization of sound sources, but it does help to create a realistic illusion.

Subject: Re: Is stereo a misunderstood logic?
Posted by [The Noise](#) on Fri, 05 Aug 2016 11:38:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wayne explained it very well, but the same logic can be used with video also. That sports car that accelerated off the bridge and into that plane that helped accentuate the preceding car chase? It didn't actually happen. The producers created that illusion. That guitar solo with the echo at the end to help accentuate the whole thing? That echo didn't come out of the guitar, it came from the producers booth.

Mono is the only true recording of anything that happens in real life. Stereo creates layers to the original to make it sound better.
