

---

Subject: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....

Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 14:20:38 GMT

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

---

t;>>>>

> >> >>>

> >

http://www.adkproaudio.com/systems/saved\_system.cfm?systemid=103&saved\_id=89

> >> >>>>> 35

> >> >>>>>

> >> >>>>> :)

> >> >>>>>

> >> >>>>> Chris

> >> >>>>>

> >> >>>>>

> >> >>>>> --

> >> >>>>> Chris Ludwig

> >> >>>>>

> >> >>>>> ADK Pro Audio

> >> >>>>> (859) 635-5762

> >> >>>>> www.adkproaudio.com

> >> >>>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com

> >> >>>>>

> >> >>>>>

> >> >>>> --

> >> >>>> Chris Ludwig

> >> >>>> ADK

> >> >>>> chrisl@adkproaudio.com <mailto:chrisl@adkproaudio.com>

> >> >>>> www.adkproaudio.com <

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....

Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 15:00:14 GMT

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

---

mix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net" target="\_blank">animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net>  
wrote in message

news:450e471d\$1@linux...

> He wrote the software program that MRI machines are using these days.

Very

> interesting guy. I'm mastering a project for his wife. He was pretty

> interested in the Paris program. His wife is pretty well known in the LA

> music community and he digs this stuff. I may ask him if he could write a

> delay compensation applet for Paris. He really got a chuckle out of

> Frankencomp.....said he's built a few similar monstrosities himself.

They

> will be back over here tomorrow night.

>

> ;o)

>

>

>

>Sorry, brother. There's too much evidence that Bush and Co. were really, really, really eager to invade Iraq, even in the face of well-documented evidence that they were barking up the wrong tree, even that they knew they were barking up the wrong tree. It's a matter of record that the CIA was skeptical about the "slam-dunk" theory of WMDs, as espoused unequivocally by Cheney over and over again before the invasion.

There are documents dating from the mid-'90s showing key Bush administration officials and advisors making concrete, detailed plans to make an example of Iraq by invading it and "nation building" it int

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 15:02:57 GMT

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

---

o an ally. That certainly had nothing to do with Clinton's administration. The general consensus on the part of most reasonable folk is that Iraq was a dead-center target for Bush, et al, loooooong before he got elected.

Frankly, I gave them the benefit of the doubt as the invasion occurred. I said to myself, maybe they're right. Maybe we win, things shift in the Mid-East, we're all happier. Didn't work out that way.

We didn't have to do it. Fact is, certain now-powerful neo-cons had been fantasizing about it for a decade or more when Bush took office, and they seized the opportunity and made it happen. And because of that, we're up to our necks in a global firestorm of hate and civil war and over-extension and tactical weakness.

Any attempt to lay all of this at the feet of anybody other than the current administration seems awfully wrong-headed to me. Just seems like desperation, ideological desperation.

God help us if we find ourselves routinely torturing people in order to preserve our way of life. God help us. That's not who I want to be. I'll leave this country before that becomes commonplace. I won't be party to the torture of other humans in order to preserve for ourselves cheap gas and relative safety from those who have learned to hate us at least PARTLY because we have been manipulating their governments, their history, their economies and their lives for decades solely to keep a steady flow of cheap oil.

I despise the destruction of innocent lives. Be clear on that. And I love my country above all else. But I will not be a hypocrite, and I will not be bullied into hard-partisan faux-patriotism. I fear we are losing our grip, as a nation, on what it means to be an American. It is a fear that seizes my heart like a clammy premonition of impending doom. I hope I am wrong.....

BTW, if we want to

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....

Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 15:10:26 GMT

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

---

win this war on conservative terms, we need to show everybody right now how we will deal with those who harbor non-traditional combatants in their midsts, whether it's Lebanon or Pakistan or Syria or Iran: we nuke them. Just the major cities. Warn folks a few days before we drop the hammer, give 'em time to get out.

That's how we won WWII, more or less. Anything less isn't going to work. Anything less is the worst sort of wishy-washy hypocrisy. War is hell, and anything less than hell isn't war. End of discussion.

Over and out.

Jimmy

"Deej" <[animixx@animass.net](mailto:animixx@animass.net)> wrote in message [news:4510cf27\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:4510cf27$1@linux...)

>

> Hi Jimmy,

>

> No offense taken here. My point is that we are finishing a war that was  
> started by Sadaam, not Bush. It was never brought to any conclusion  
be3cause

> the sanctions that were put in place to do this were circumvented and this  
> was during Clinton's administration. Clinton also instituted a policy  
> wherein our CIA couldn't work with anyone who had any taint of human  
rights

> abuses and also did everything they could to keep the various intelligence  
> service and the domestic intelligence services from sharing information.

> All

> of these things played a huge part in what happened on 9-11 and the crappy  
> intelligence was what we based the decision on to go in and finish the  
gulf

> war that Sadaam started. Had we accurate intelligence, I'll bet things  
would

> have been handled much differently. You may not agree with this and that's

> OK. I'm not going to flog it anymore or Kim's gonna get pissed off at me  
> and  
> I might die.  
>  
> I've said my piece here. If you want to discuss this off the group it's  
> animix@animas.net.  
>  
> Regards,  
>  
> Deej  
>  
>  
> "Deej" <animix@animas.net> wrote:  
> >  
> >"Uptown Jimmy" <

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....  
Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 15:29:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

h.net" target="\_blank">johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:  
> >>Man.  
> >>  
> >>I'm sorry, DJ. You've been good to me, and I don't mean to offend you,  
> but  
> >I  
> >>don't quite understand what you're trying to say.  
> >>  
> >>Not that I don't pay attention to things, usually....  
> >>  
> >>I just think people ought to have to take responsibility for their own  
> >>actions.  
> >>  
> >>And I don't recall Slick Willy invading Iraq.  
> >>  
> >>Guess I'm just ignernt.  
> >>  
> >>Jimmy  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message  
> >>news:45109ebf@linux...  
> >>> No. I think the situation in Iraq, as it stands right now, is a result  
> >>of  
> >>> the left undercutting the administration at every turn and thereby  
giving  
> >>> aid and encouragement to our enemies who, when they see the country so

> >>> divided, can take it to the bank that the left will do their fair  
share  
> >to  
> >>> defeat our efforts. I'm just blaming the intelligence deficit and the  
> >lack  
> >>> of leadership that led to the UN sanctions being undercut at every  
turn  
> >on  
> >>> Clinton, otherwise the war that started in 1991, would not still be  
> >>> happening. Thus is a war that never stopped. It could have if Clinton  
> >>would  
> >>> have had his eye on the ball and exercised some of the great  
> >>\*international  
> >>> leadership\* that his supporters fantasize so much about.....but he  
> >>> didn't. He allowed the sanctions to be undercut by \*our allies\*.  
> >>>  
> >>

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 17:56:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

t;> accurate intelligence. Had this been available, then I doubt  
> >>that  
> >>> > > Bush,  
> >>> > > >>> Kerry, Kennedy Pelosi and the rest would have authorized the  
> >>> > invasion  
> >>> > of  
> >>> > > >>> Iraq, or perhaps they would have been able to find the WMD's  
> >>> before  
> >>> > they  
> >>> > > >>> were shipped out of the country or hidden. I just find it  
hard  
> >>to  
> >>> > > > stomach  
> >>> > > >>> the hypocrisy of the democrats whose policies neutered our  
> >>> > intelligence  
> >>> > > >>> services in the '90's when they turn around and blame Bush  
> for  
> >>the  
> >>> > > > decisions  
> >>> > > >>> made based on the intelligence blunders they created in the  
> >>first  
> >>> > place.  
> >>> > > >>>  
> >>> > > >>> Regards,  
> >>> > > >>>

> >>> > > >>> DeeJ  
> >>> > > >>>  
> >>> > > >>>  
> >>> > > >>>> Cheers,  
> >>> > > >>>> -Jamie  
> >>> > > >>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>  
> >>> > > >>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>  
> >>> > > >>>> DJ wrote:  
> >>> > > >>>>> I don't see us overreacting Jamie. However, if there is  
> >>> indication  
> >>> > > of  
> >>> > > >>> some  
> >>> > > >>>>> sort of major threat, do we run and tell the NY times or  
> do  
> >we  
> >>> > blow  
> >>> > > > the  
> >>> > > >>>>> threat away before it pays us a visit?  
> >>> > > >>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
> >>> > > > news:450f0b12@linux...  
> >>> > > >>>>&g

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 18:06:17 GMT

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

---

r />

> >>> > > >>> for  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Lutherans, and for good reason.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> A Pope criticizing other religions (even other  
Christian  
> >>> > sects,  
> >>> > > >>> even  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> other Catholics) is nothing new. Certainly much  
harsher  
> >>> > things  
> >>> > > > have  
> >>> > > >>>>>>> been  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> said about Islam by some (not all) extreme  
fundamentalist  
> >>> > > >>> Christians.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> And certainly much harsher things have been said by  
> >> certain

> >>> > > >>> extremist  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> Islamists about Christianity. The more extremist of  
> both  
> >>> > camps  
> >>> > > > seem  
> >>> > > >>>>> to  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> be spoiling to relive the crusades. With some of the  
> >more  
> >>> > power  
> >>> > > >>>> hungry  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> ready to endanger civilization by attempting to  
incite  
> >>> > > religious  
> >>> > > >>> wars  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> for their own questionable ends.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> It's a vast generalization to say the "the left" or  
> >>> > > "secularists"  
> >>> > > >>> or  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> even "Christians" are demanding an apology from the  
> Pope.  
> >>I  
> >>> > > think  
> >>> > > > a  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> whole lot of people think the Pope can say whatever  
> he  
> >>> wants.  
> >>> > > It  
> >>> > > >>>>>> doesn't  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> matter to most non-Catholics in the USA and in  
reality,  
> >>> Papal  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> declarations are ignored by a fair number of  
Catholics  
> >>> here,  
> >>> > > too.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> Obviously some Moslems are upset in some places, but  
> >how  
> >>> deep  
> >>> > > > does  
> >>> > > >>>> that  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> go? When black churches were burning in the USA, it

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....

Posted by [brandon\[2\]](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 18:13:19 GMT

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

---



> >>> > > >>>>>> that  
> >>> > > >>>>>>> it is rationality as opposed to irrationality.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
> >>> > > >>>>> news:450ec970@linux...  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>> The Catholic church doesn't speak for Christianity.  
> >>> Certainly  
> >>> > > not

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....

Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 19:00:39 GMT

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

---

ading if any of you are

> >>> > interested.

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>>

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Have a great Monday!

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> -----

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> The Unholy Alliance Rolls Over the Pope

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> By Andrew Walden

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> In what has suddenly been made into a highly

> >> controversial

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> speech, the day after September 11, at Bavaria's

> >>> University

> >>> > of

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Regensburg, Pope Benedict describes Christian belief

> > in

> >> a

> >>> > God

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> whose words and acts are bound by reason, truth and

> > the

> >>> law

> >>> > of

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> non-contradiction. Benedict contrasts this with  
Islamic

> >>> > > belief

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> in a God not bound by anything-including his own  
words.

> >>> > > > Benedict

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of  
secular

> >>> > > > humanists

> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.



to Hitler and Mussolini and  
accused  
> >>> him  
> >>> > of  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> "Across the Islamic world Friday, Benedict's remarks  
> >on  
> >>> > Islam  
> >>> > > > and  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of  
> >rage  
> >>> > that  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like  
those  
> >>> that  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> followed publication of caricatures of the Prophet  
> >>> > Muhammad."  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Reuters quoted other sources expressing fears for  
the  
> >>> Pope's  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> The Islamist reaction proves Manuel II's  
600-year-old  
> >>> point.  
> >>> > > > The  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> reaction is not one of anger but a calculated  
attempt  
> >to  
> >>> > force  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> the Pope to parrot the PC line on Islam. Since Islam  
> >>need  
> >>> > not  
> >>> > > be  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> internally consistent and it is not bound by reason,  
> >>it's  
> >>> > only  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> objective can be to assert the power of a God who is  
> >so  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> transcendent that He is not bound by anything. If  
man  
> >is  
> >>> > > created  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> in God's image then by extension Islamic man is not  
> >>bound

> >>> by  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the  
 part  
 > >>>of  
 > >>> > some  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Muslims to lie.) Islamists are not responding to any  
 > >>> > 'offense'  
 > >>> > > > to  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the  
 > >>>only  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> 'morality' they have-the will to power.  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> "Will to Power" is a key element of Nietzsche's  
 > >>> > > > philosophy-hence  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> the root of the term, Islamofascist. Moreover the  
 > >>>Western  
 > >>> > > "Left"  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist  
 > >>> thought  
 > >>> > > > than  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> by Marxist thought-hence the alliance between the  
 > >>>Western  
 > >>> > > "Left"  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> and the Islamofascist 'Right.'  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing  
 precisely  
 > >>> what  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Manuel II said they would: "Syed Ahmed Bukhari, the  
 > >>>chief  
 > >>> > > cleric  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest  
 > >>> mosque,  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> extolled Muslims to 'respond in a manner which  
 forces  
 > >>>the  
 > >>> > Pope  
 > >>> > > > to  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> apologize.'" Note they intend to use "force" not  
 > >>>reason.  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the  
 > >>>Pope  
 > >>> > was,  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> "calling a spade a spade".  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
 > >>> > > >>>>>>>>> The secularist mouthpiece, New York  
 Times,editorializes,

> >>> > "Pope  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Benedict XVI has insulted Muslims.." This is false.  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 20:16:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

; >>The  
> >>> > Pope  
> >>> > > 's  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by  
> >>reason  
> >>> is  
> >>> > > not  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What  
> >>> Muslims  
> >>> > > and  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> secularists fear is the Pope's decision to choose to  
> >>enter  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How  
> >dare  
> >>> he  
> >>> > > not  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> "apologize" for being a Christian? That is the  
> >>so-called  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> "insult."  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> One might "reasonably" ask when will Muslims  
> "apologize"  
> >>> for  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to  
> the  
> >>> point  
> >>> > is  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> lost on them.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Amazingly the Times continues: "Muslim leaders the  
> world  
> >>> > over  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> have demanded apologies. For many Muslims, holy war  
> >-  
> >>> > jihad -  
> >>> > > is  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence."  
>  
> >In

[illegible]

>  
> >The  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> secularists too seek the Pope's submission. Like  
the  
> >>> > > Islamists,  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> the secularists are driven only by their will to  
power.  
> >>> > While  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> the Islamists represent their demented version of  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> God--unrestrained by reason, the secularists  
represent  
> >>> their  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> demented version of reason--unrestrained by God.  
They  
> >>are  
> >>> > > > united  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> by their self-worshipping world view.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> It should be noted that the carefully staged "anger"  
> >>from  
> >>> > the  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Islamic world does not condemn Benedict's  
> >>characterization  
> >>> > of  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> Islam as a religion where God's "will is not bound  
> up  
> >>with  
> >>> > any  
> >>> > > > of  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>>

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....  
Posted by [Victor Lethbridge](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 20:25:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

;>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The  
Islamic)  
> >>> God  
> >>> > > is  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>> not bound even by his own word.." This is not seen  
> >as  
> >>an  
> >>> > > > insult.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this  
> >>> > description  
> >>> > > > of  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading

> >>> French  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of  
> >>> > Professor  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> Likewise the secularists express no dismay at the  
pope's  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> characterization of a secularist as: "(A) subject  
> (who)  
> >>> > then  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he  
> >>> considers  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective  
> >>> > 'conscience  
> >>> > > '  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical."  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without  
God,  
> >>> there  
> >>> > > can  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> be no modern system of morality. He explains, "In  
> this  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> way.ethics and religion lose their power to create  
> a  
> >>> > community  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> and become (instead) a completely personal matter."  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>>  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> Both Islamist and secularist seek to break God and  
> >>reason  
> >>> > > apart.  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West.  
They  
> >>> > believe  
> >>> > > >>>>>>>>>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As  
> >&gt;

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

Page 16 of 27 ---- Generated from The PARIS Forums

Page 17 of 27 ---- Generated from The PARIS Forums

playback but the stability of the system is much improved.  
I guess you could say all native DAWs in that respect do it.

AA

"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message  
news:4511d78f@linux...

> So the point of lookahead is to give the digital math time to process the  
> audio data?

>

> Are there any examples of this sort of thing in other DAWs?

>

> Jimmy

>

>

> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
> news:45109336\$1@linux...

>> It essentially splits the signal into two paths.. one for the detector

>> and

>> one that is the audio throughput. By NOT delaying the detector and  
> delaying

>> the audio by, let's say, 1 mS the detector actually gets a 1 mS

> 'lookahead'

>> time to better process the signal/transients.

>> The price is that now your audio will be 1 mS later than it was. This can  
> be

>> a real bite in the rear on multitracked stuff like drum kits unless you

>> intentionally delay the other tracks by the same amount (and the next

>> step

>> is to move them all back/to the left 1mS in the editor).

>>

>> AA

>>

>> "Uptown Jimmy" <

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 22:50:22 GMT

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

---

;c@c.om> wrote in message news:4510872c\$1@linux...

>> >>

>> >> Depending on lookahead of course :-)

>> >>

>> >> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:

>> >> >

>> >> >Yeah, 2 samples of latency (at 44.1) for eds plugs

>> >> >Rod

>> >> >Chris Ludwig <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote:

>> >> >>Hi Jimmy,

>> >> >>As far as I've ever seen the EDS plugins have little or no latency

>> >> >>as

>> >> >>they exist in the hardware just like on a Pro Tools HD system.

>> >> >>Chris

>> >> >>

>> >> >>

>> >> >>Uptown Jimmy wrote:

>> >> >>> Wait a minute: Paris atuo-compenstaes for EDS plugins?!

>> >> >>>

>> >> >>> I'm very surprised, if true.

>> >> >>>

>> >> >>> Jimmy

>> >> >>>

>> >> >>> "Chris Ludwig" <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote in message

>> >> >>> news:450ff34f\$1@linux...

>> >> >>>> HI,

>> >> >>>> It only matters under 2 scenarios.

>> >> >>>> 1. Playing VST INstruments in real time.

>> >> >>>> 2. Processing native effects on a live input.

>> >> >>>>

>> >> >>>> Otherwise you can set the buffer high to free up resources.

>> >> >>>> When using Direct monitoring the software monitor inputs at the

>> > hardware

>> >> >>>> level so no latency.

>> >> >>>>

>> >> >>>> ADC becomes more useful in the mixing stage Cubase will keep all

>> > the

>> >> >>>> plug ins including external plug ins sample accurate. Paris will

>> > do

>> >> this

>> >> >>>> only with its EDS effects not with native. Actually most programs

>> > didn't

>> >> >>>> only had this type of compensation on inserts only forever.

>> > Steinberg

>> >> >>>> were the first to figure out how to do it across the whole path.

>> >> >>>> I

>> > wish

>> >> >>>> Steinberg would stop with all the innovation stuff so I wouldn't

>> >> >>>> have

>> >> >to

>> >> >>>> keep track of all the new features the competitors have in their

>> >> >>>> programs. :0

>> >> >>>>

>> >> >>>>

>> >> >>>>

>> >> >>>> Chris

>> >> >>>>  
>> >> >>>>  
>> >> >>>>  
>> >> >>>> Uptown Jimmy wrote:  
>> >> >>>> What do buffer and latency matter for anymore, what with ADC on  
>> > native  
>> >> >>>> systems?  
>> >> >>>>  
>> >> >>>> I seriously have no idea, being a Paris junkie since the  
> beginning.  
>> >> >>>>  
>> >> >>>> Jimmy  
>> >> >>>>  
>> >> >>>> "Chris Ludwig" <chrisl@adkproaudio.com> wrote in message  
>> >> >>>> news:450f2d33@linux...  
>> >> >>>>  
>> >> >>>>> HI Mike,  
>> >> >>>>>  
>> >> >>>>>  
>> >> >>>>> Mike R. wrote:  
>> >> >>>>>  
>> >> >>>>>> Hope it's ok to post this question here.  
>> >> >>>>>> A friend of mine is going to buy a new Mac laptop. She is  
>> >> >>>>>> running  
>> >> >>>>> Cubase SE  
>> >> >>>>>  
>> >> >>>>>> on her current  
>> >> >>>>>> No Universal Binary yet for Cubase not till 4.0 comes out so I  
>> > don't  
>> >> >>>>>> think it will work if it is a Intel based one.  
>> >> >>>>>>  
>> >> >>>>>> 'pute and wants a bigger faster, but portable, machine.  
>> >> >>>>>>  
>> >> >>>>>>  
>> >> >>>>>>  
>> >> >>>>>> I'm  
>> >> >>>>>>  
>> >> >>>>>>> most interested in your thoughts regarding both an audio card  
> and  
>> >> >what  
>> >> >>>>> sort  
>> >> >>>>>  
>> >> >>>>>>> of external audio drive she could/should use.  
>> >> >>>>>>> On a budget the Presonus Firebox is a great unit. If she want  
>> > quality  
>> >> >>>>>>> Mic-Pres and AD/DA, etc then the RME Fireface 400.  
>> >> >>>>>>> Also the Mackie Spike or Onyx 400f might be a good option sense  
>> > they

>> >> >>>>> come with the Traktion software already.  
>> >> >>>>>  
>> >> >>>>> If she is only recording 2 tracks or so then there is no need  
> for  
>> >> an  
>> >> >>>>> external drive. It would only be needed for backups but the  
>> > projects  
>> >> >>>>> would more than likely be small enough to easily fit on DVDRW.  
>> >> >>>>> Using an internal 80 or 100 gig drive on the PC would easily  
> allow  
>> >> >for  
>> >> >>>>> 32 tracks of 2

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....  
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2006 23:18:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

blank">1@linux...  
> This might be about the best news I've heard re the borders in my  
> lifetime.  
>  
> [http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/boeingaerospace/200326\\_6715\\_boeing20.html](http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/boeingaerospace/200326_6715_boeing20.html)  
>Will report back....

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
news:4511e65c@linux...  
> Probably so, at least for this little exercise.  
> AA  
>  
> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message  
> news:451172cd@linux...  
> > On this morning's boot-up, I didn't even see the screen in question.  
> >  
> > Should I disable "quick boot-up" in the BIOS?  
> >  
> > Jimmy  
> >  
> > "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
> > news:4510c140\$1@linux...  
> >> dat's the one  
> >> AA  
> >>  
> >> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message  
> >> news:4510babe@linux...  
> >> > Ummm.....I'm too poor to afford a video cam.  
> >> >

> > > To be honest, EMU discontinuing Paris was one of the best things that  
> > ever  
> > > happened to me. Cheap parts, ya know....  
> > >  
> > > By "pause key", you mean the key that says "pause" & "break"?  
> > >  
> > > I know I seem ignernt. I'm sorry.  
> > >  
> > > Jimmy  
> > >  
> > >  
> > >  
> > > "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
> > > news:451090ed@linux...  
> > >> er.. do you know you can hit the pause key on the keyboard and stop  
> > >> it?  
> > > Just  
> > >> hit the spacebar when you're ready to go again.  
> > >> Sorry I didn't mention that before. Or alternately you could point a  
> > >> video  
> > >> cam at it.  
> > >>  
> > >> AA  
> > >>  
> > >>  
> > >> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message  
> > >> news:45107fd4\$1@linux...  
> > >> > Like I said before, that particular screen flashes by almost  
> > > subliminally.  
> > >> >  
> > >> > I had great success today with one EDS card, trying it in one PCI  
> > slot  
> > > at  
> > >> > a  
> > >> > time, all four PCI slots, no problems. I'll throw all four in  
there  
> > and  
> > >> > see  
> > >> > what happens. I'll check the msinfo thingie befoe I boot up Paris.  
> > >> > It  
> > > will  
> >&

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....  
Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Sat, 26 Aug 2006 03:40:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

gt; wrote in message

news:4511e40a@linux...

> Sorry, brother. There's too much evidence that Bush and Co. were really,  
> really, really eager to invade Iraq, even in the face of well-documented  
> evidence that they were barking up the wrong tree, even that they knew  
they

> were barking up the wrong tree. It's a matter of record that the CIA was  
> skeptical about the "slam-dunk" theory of WMDs, as espoused unequivocally  
by

> Cheney over and over again before the invasion.

>

> There are documents dating from the mid-'90s showing key Bush  
administration

> officials and advisors making concrete, detailed plans to make an example  
of

> Iraq by invading it and "nation building" it into an ally. That certainly  
> had nothing to do with Clinton's administration. The general consensus on  
the

> part of most reasonable folk is that Iraq was a dead-center target for  
Bush,

> et al, loooooong before he got elected.

>

> Frankly, I gave them the benefit of the doubt as the invasion occurred. I

> said to myself, maybe they're right. Maybe we win, things shift in the

> Mid-East, we're all happier. Didn't work out that way.

>

> We didn't have to do it. Fact is, certain now-powerful neo-cons had been

> fantasizing about it for a decade or more when Bush took office, and they

> seized the opportunity and made it happen. And because of that, we're up  
to

> our necks in a global firestorm of hate and civil war and over-extension  
and

> tactical weakness.

>

> Any attempt to lay all of this at the feet of anybody other than the

> current administration seems awfully wrong-headed to me. Just seems like

> desperation, ideological desperation.

>

> God help us if we find ourselves routinely torturing people in order to

> preserve our way of life. God help us. That's not who I want to be. I'll

> leave this country before that becomes commonplace. I won't be party to  
the

> torture of other humans in order to preserve for ourselves cheap gas and

> relative safety from those who have learned to hate us at least PARTLY

> because we have been manipulating their governments, their history, their

> economies and their lives for decades solely to keep a steady flow of  
cheap

> oil.

>  
> I despise the destruction of innocent lives. Be clear on that. And I love  
my  
> country above all else. But I will not be a hypocrite, and I will not be  
> bullied into hard-partisan faux-patriotism. I fear we are losing our grip,  
> as a nation, on what it means to be an American. It is a fear that seizes  
my  
> heart like a clammy premonition of impending doom. I hope I am wrong.....  
>  
> BTW, if we want to win this war on conservative terms, we need to show  
> everybody right now how we will deal with those who harbor non-traditional  
> combatants in their midsts, whether it's Lebanon or Pakistan or Syria or  
> Iran: we nuke them. Just the major cities. Warn folks a few days before we  
> drop the hammer, give 'em time to get out.  
>  
> That's how we won WWII, more or less. Anything less isn't going to work.  
> Anything less is the worst sort of wishy-washy hypocrisy. War is hell, and  
> anything less than hell isn't war. End of discussion.  
>  
> Over and out.  
>  
> Jimmy  
>  
>  
> "Deej" <animixx@animass.net> wrote in message news:4510cf27\$1@linux...  
> >  
> > Hi Jimmy,  
> >  
> > No offense taken here. My point is that we are finishing a war that was  
> > started by Sadaam, not Bush. It was never brought to any conclusion  
> > because  
> > the sanctions that were put in place to do this were circumvented and  
this  
> > was during Clinton's administration. Clinton also instituted a policy  
> > wherein our CIA couldn't work with anyone who had any taint of human  
> rights  
> > abuses and also did everything they could to keep the various  
intelligence  
> > service and the domestic intelligence services from sharing information.  
> > All  
> > of these things playe

---

---

Subject: Re: OT: How much force in "pounds" do you think.....  
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sun, 27 Aug 2006 02:54:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>>> > > office once again and end up in an even bigger mess.....and

> > >> > yes.....it  
> > >> > > could be much bigger if the liberals take control of the  
national  
> > >> > > legislature.....much less, god forbid, having another Clinton  
in  
> > >the  
> > >> > white  
> > >> > > House.  
> > >> > >  
> > >> > >  
> > >> > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
> > >>news:451035a7@linux...  
> > >> > > >  
> > >> > > > For most of the Clinton years the balance of power was divided  
> > >>between  
> > >> > > > both parties. Again, there is plenty of finger pointing to go  
> > >>around.  
> > >> > > > It's easy enough in hindsight to criticize the previous  
> > >>administration  
> > >> > > > on a number of counts.  
> > >> > > >  
> > >> > > > And in retrospect, those dems made a mistake trusting Bush  
with  
> > >that  
> > >> > > > vote. OTOH, it was a moment of unity.  
> > >> > > >  
> > >> > > > Flash forward. Today all branches of national government are  
> > >> controlled  
> > >> > > > by one party. It doesn't bother me if you want to point blame  
at  
> > >>some  
> > >> of  
> > >> > > > the policies under Clinton. But again, merely pointing fingers  
> > >> backwards  
> > >> > > > in no way excuses the mistakes and failures of the current  
> > >>government.  
> > >> > > >  
> > >> > > > They walked in stating in clear terms that they felt the  
> previous  
> > >> > > > government was wrong about almost everything, and then fell  
flat  
> > >> > > > overall, domestically and internationally.  
> > >> > > >  
> > >> > > > Looking at both governments, we can do better. We must do  
> better.  
> > >> > > > At some point, and we're coming up on six years, the buck  
stops  
> > >with

> > >> > > those in charge now.  
> > >> > >  
> > >> > > Cheers,  
> > >> > > -Jamie  
> > >> > > <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>  
> > >> > >  
> > >> > >  
> > >> > >  
> > >> > > DJ wrote:  
> > >> > > > The dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on  
Iraq  
> > >as a  
> > >> > last  
> > >> > > > resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done  
as  
> > >>such.  
> > >> > > >  
> > >> > > > How convenient for them when it was the intelligence service  
> > that  
> > >> they  
> > >> > > > created over 8 years of hard work that they now attempt to  
> slag  
> > >>and  
> > >> > > blame  
> > >> > > > for their decisions so they can vote for the war before  
they  
> > >vote  
> > >> > > against  
> > >> > > > it.  
> > >> > > >  
> > >> > > > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
> > >> > news:450f8aec@linux...  
> > >> > > > There is plenty of finger pointing to go around. No doubt  
> > >>specific  
> > >> > > > things could have been handled better under the previous  
> > >> government.  
> > >> > > >  
> > >> > > > The transition of power between the previous and current  
> > >> governments  
> > >> > > was  
> > >> > > > pretty rocky, and a "not invented here" syndrome may have  
> doomed  
> > >> the  
> > >> > > > hand-off of some al-Qaida related work that was in  
progress.  
> > >> > > >  
> > >> > > > In any case, no government gets a pass by blaming the  
> previous

> > >> > > >> government. The current government, for example, failed to  
> follow  
> > >> > > >> through and prioritize the al-Qaida threat ahead of 9/11  
and  
> > >> failed  
> > >> > to  
> > >> > > >> prevent 9/11; failed to find and capture Bin Laden in  
> > >> Afghanistan;  
> > >> > > >> failed to overcome Taliban control of large areas of  
> Afghanistan;  
> > >> > > >> allowed record drug production to reestablish itself there;  
> > >> failed  
> > >> to  
> > >> > > >> plan for post Iraq invasion problems predicted by their own  
> > state  
> > >> > > >> department; and they have continually exploited the "war on  
> > >> > terrorism"  
> > >> > > >> for domestic political ends.  
> > >> > > >>  
> > >> > > >> You assert the WMDs were there. However Bush's chief  
> inspector,  
> > >> and  
> > >> > > Bush  
> > >> > > >> himself, say they weren't there after all. It was a bluff.  
> One  
> > >>  
> > >> the  
> > >> > > >> Iraqi expatriate promoters of the bluff got the ear of our  
> > >> > government,  
> > >> > > >> was believed, and, last I heard, had parlayed it into a  
> position  
> > >> of  
> > >> > > >> power in Iraq after the invasion.  
> > >> > > >>  
> > >> > > >> The Dems you mentioned authorized the military attack on  
Iraq  
> > >> as  
> > >> a  
> > >> > last  
> > >> > > >> &

---