
Subject: Snow

Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 24 Nov 2007 17:26:28 GMT

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

TAKE 1 MILLION SPERM TO FERTILIZE ONE EGG?

>>> (they don't stop to ask directions)

>>>

>>> 4. WHY DO MEN SNORE WHEN THEY LIE ON THEIR BACKS?

>>> (because their balls fall over their butt-hole and they vapor

>>> lock)

>>>

>>> 5. WHY WERE MEN GIVEN LARGER BRAINS THAN DOGS?

>>> (so they won't hump women's legs at cocktails parties)

>>>

>>> 6. WHY DID GOD MAKE MEN BEFORE WOMEN?

>>> (you need a rough draft before you make a final copy)

>>>

>>> 7. HOW MANY MEN DOES IT TAKE TO PUT A TOILET SEAT DOWN?

>>> (don't know.....it never happened)

>>>

>>> And the personal favorite:

>>>

>>> 8. WHY DID GOD PUT MEN ON EARTH?

>>> (because a vibrator can't mow the lawn)

>>>

>>> One day my housework-challenged husband decided to wash his Sweat-shirt

>>> Seconds after he stepped into the laundry room, he shouted to me, 'What

>>> setting do I use on the washing machine?'

>>>

>>> 'It depends,' I replied. 'What does it say on your shirt?'

>>>

>>> He yelled back, ' University of Oklahoma ..'

>>>

>>> And they say blondes are dumb...

>>>

>>>

>>> A couple is lying in bed. The man says, 'I am going to make you the

>>> happiest

>>> woman in the world.'

>>>

>>> The woman replies, 'I'll miss you...

>>

>>Smarter? Naaa. Loonier maybe. If you were loonier you would have thought of that.

S

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message

news:2mamo3hjje0huv008c9bbq55efk88mc94r@4ax.com...
> and if i were smarter i would have thought of that...
>
> On Sun, 13 Jan 2008 03:16:51 -0800, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
> wrote:
>
>>"Ignoransk is blisk" - Popeye
>>
>>S
>>
>>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>news:32qjo3tacag3k1niba4n0sdgo18aafjb5v@4ax.com...
>>> but they're happy...afterall ignorance is bliss.
>>>
>>> On 13 Jan 2008 14:09:17 +1000, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>You are spot on. Our educational system started to decline in the late
>>>>>'60s and has never recovered
>>>>>
>>>>>In analyzing a changing trend in a statistic, such as the decline in
>>>>>the
>>>>>
>>>>>quality of the US school system, what you must do is look just BEFORE
>>>>>the change occurred to find what caused it. What changed in the US
>>>>>school system that has caused the drastic reduction in results?
>>>>>
>>>>>Discuss please...
>>>>>
>>>>>Taking the emphasis off competition, pass/ fail grading and passing
>>>>>students
>>>>>
>>>>>along without them being able to accomplish the coursework.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>Sarah, It's hard to confront evil. Sometimes evil people smile and laugh
and seem like,they are your friend. But truly evil actions are not done
by accident. Can you think of any word other than "evil" for drugging 8
million helpless and innocent children with a harmful and very powerful
narcotic? It is NO ACCIDENT and it is VERY EVIL.

Confront it.

Sarah wrote:

> Now, settle down, Bill . . . don't go all Tom Cruise on us. "Battlefield
> Earth" was just a book and a movie . . . the psych-iatrists/ologists are not
> evil aliens from another galaxy . . . or ARE they? (dunt dunt duuunnnnn . .

> .) Psychs . . . Psychlos . . . hmmm.
>
> I admire that Scientology usually demands specifics and personal
> observation, but when it comes to psychiatry, it's all broad generalities.
> I know a fair number of psychs through my job, and if there's an evil
> conspiracy to ruin humanity, I think someone forgot to clue them in. Now,
> the pharmaceutical companies . . . that's another story.
>
> But thanks for the nice compliment. I should tell you, though, that I'm not
> particularly young, and the fact that I can count spilled toothpicks at a
> glance doesn't make me bright.
>
> I'm an excellent driver.
>
> S
>
>
> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:478a535f\$1@linux...
>> Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our bright
>> young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a campaign to
>> influence the schools and school systems and the teaching colleges in a
>> big way.
>>
>> In the '50s at an annual convention, the head of American Psychiatric
>> Association publicly declared their new goal of creating a "Value Neutral
>> Society". Their aim was to blur and eradicate the distinction between
>> right and wrong.
>>
>> They knew that the sure way to change society was by influencing the
>> children. Psychiatrists have gradually introduced to our schools the mass
>> drugging of children and even infants (approximately 8 million on Ritalin
>> type drugs), Outcome Based Education (doesn't matter how much or how well
>> children learn, just that they felt good about it) and the rest of their
>> psuchobabble notions of how people should think and behave.
>>
>> Who was the most influential proponent of the "drug culture"? Not
>> coincidentally, a psychologist and college professor, Dr. Timothy Leary.
>>
>> When you hear someone derided for being "judgmental", that is the
>> influence of psychiatric double speak. Smart, ethical people used to be
>> regarded as showing "good judgment", but now that positive attribute of
>> being able to rightly judge people and situations has been slyly skewed
>> into a bad thing. I'm sure you have noticed other examples of how
>> illogical psychiatric concepts have replaced good reasoning.
>>
>> When you look around our society and see the delineation between right and
>> wrong, logical and illogical, smart and stupid being blurred it is no
>> accident. Look to the only group who has for over 50 years had that as

>> their stated aim: psychiatry and psychology.

>>

>> We can fix our schools but we must first recognize the source of the

>> problem and erase its influence or it will only get worse. Our children

>> are our responsibility.

>>

>>

>> rick wrote:

>>> yup, a bunch of egotistical numbnuts. it astounds me the level of non

>>> educated college graduates we're churning out...with pride.

>>>

>>>

>>> On Sun, 13 Jan 2008 01:29:11 -0800, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>

>>> wrote:

>>>

>>>> I think you got it, Don. Psychologists pretending to know something

>>>> decided that discipline and competen were harmful to children's mental

>>>> health.

>>>>

>>>> S

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4789a15e\$1@linux...

>>>>> Self esteem replaced achievement.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>

>Kids have little choice when adults conspire to do EVIL. For example, I

was subjected to the EVILS of orthodontics! Hauled into a small room

against my will and tortured with small instruments wielded by sadists.

Cleverly painful devices were attached to my teeth and wires were

tightened periodically to keep my teeth in line. Four perfectly good

teeth were yanked out during the multi-year program of abuse. Drugs were

used, but never enough. Even after all that, my teeth never admitted

anything, not even name, rank or serial number.

Granted, now I have straight teeth, but still!

I'm pretty sure the evils of the world can be rightly blamed on

orthodontists. Millions of kids were subjected to this, and also some

adults. It is NO ACCIDENT and VERY EVIL. :^)

Meanwhile I have observed a few psychologists and psychiatrists helping

people straighten out their lives. Not always successfully, there is

much yet to learn. Just as we will someday find better ways to

straighten teeth. But I have seen good things happen with the help of

caring people who seem to be trying to help as best they know how. Some

prescribing drugs, (our knowledge of brain chemistry and psych drugs

still seems to be at a fairly experimental stage, I'll give you that),
and some not.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Bill L wrote:

> Sarah, It's hard to confront evil. Sometimes evil people smile and laugh
> and seem like they are your friend. But truly evil actions are not done
> by accident. Can you think of any word other than "evil" for drugging 8
> million helpless and innocent children with a harmful and very powerful
> narcotic? It is NO ACCIDENT and it is VERY EVIL.

>

> Confront it.

>

> Sarah wrote:

>> Now, settle down, Bill . . . don't go all Tom Cruise on us.

>> "Battlefield Earth" was just a book and a movie . . . the

>> psych-iatrists/ologists are not evil aliens from another galaxy . . .

>> or ARE they? (dunt dunt duuunnnnn . . .) Psychs . . . Psychlos . .

>> . hmmm.

>>

>> I admire that Scientology usually demands specifics and personal

>> observation, but when it comes to psychiatry, it's all broad

>> generalities. I know a fair number of psychs through my job, and if

>> there's an evil conspiracy to ruin humanity, I think someone forgot to

>> clue them in. Now, the pharmaceutical companies . . . that's another

>> story.

>>

>> But thanks for the nice compliment. I should tell you, though, that

>> I'm not particularly young, and the fact that I can count spilled

>> toothpicks at a glance doesn't make me bright.

>>

>> I'm an excellent driver.

>>

>> S

>>

>>

>> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message

>> news:478a535f\$1@linux...

>>> Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our

>>> bright young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a

>>> campaign to influence the schools and school systems and the teaching

>>> colleges in a big way.

>>>

>>> In the '50s at an annual convention, the head of American Psychiatric

>>> Association publicly declared their new goal of creating a "Value
>>> Neutral Society". Their aim was to blur and eradicate the distinction
>>> between right and wrong.
>>>

>>> They knew that the sure way to change society was by influencing the
>>> children. Psychiatrists have gradually introduced to our schools the
>>> mass drugging of children and even infants (approximately 8 million
>>> on Ritalin type drugs), Outcome Based Education (doesn't matter how
>>> much or how well children learn, just that they felt good about it)
>>> and the rest of their psuchobabble notions of how people should think
>>> and behave.
>>>

>>> Who was the most influential proponent of the "drug culture"? Not
>>> coincidentally, a psychologist and college professor, Dr. Timothy Leary.
>>>

>>> When you hear someone derided for being "judgmental", that is the
>>> influence of psychiatric double speak. Smart, ethical people used to
>>> be regarded as showing "good judgment", but now that positive
>>> attribute of being able to rightly judge people and situations has
>>> been slyly skewed into a bad thing. I'm sure you have noticed other
>>> examples of how illogical psychiatric concepts have replaced good
>>> reasoning.
>>>

>>> When you look around our society and see the delineation between
>>> right and wrong, logical and illogical, smart and stupid being
>>> blurred it is no accident. Look to the only group who has for over 50
>>> years had that as their stated aim: psychiatry and psychology.
>>>

>>> We can fix our schools but we must first recognize the source of the
>>> problem and erase its influence or it will only get worse. Our
>>> children are our responsibility.
>>>

>>>

>>> rick wrote:

>>>> yup, a bunch of egotistical numbnuts. it astounds me the level of non
>>>> educated college graduates we're churning out...with pride.
>>>>

>>>>

>>>> On Sun, 13 Jan 2008 01:29:11 -0800, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>

>>>>> I think you got it, Don. Psychologists pretending to know
>>>>> something decided that discipline and compotion were harmful to
>>>>> children's mental health.
>>>>>

>>>>> S
>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4789a15e\$1@linux...
>>>>> Self esteem replaced achievement.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>
>>So, Don, who decides what morals are taught? And 'me' isn't a fair answer,
though I know that's what you'd prefer.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>
>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our bright
>
>>young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a campaign to
>
>> influence the schools and school systems and the teaching colleges in
>
>>a big way.
>
>There's more to it than this. Part of it is also the cult of IQ and the
>
>separation of values reasoning and virtue from cognition.
>
>It's all intelligence, it's all cognition.
>
>But because we have been told we want a values-free education and are
>foolish enough to accept the illusion of detached neutrality, we separate
>out certain functions of the mind and call them intelligence while
>dismissing others as "not intelligence" but wisdom, virtue, honor,
>decency, etc. So we end up with Teddy Roosevelt's famous comment
>coming true in our lifetimes:
>
>"To educate a man in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to society."
>
>Today, the very idea of society, as a system of shared values and assumed
>decencies is seen as laughable by a lot of people, while "intelligence"
is
>
>treated by the quasi-educated as silicone is treated by porn stars.
>
>I don't like psychiatry much more than you do Bill (though I think there
>is a place for it in extreme cases where treatment has prevented suicides
>and murders) but it is not the source of the culture we live in. It is
a
>symptom not a cause.
>

>I am with you on drugs though. I HATE drugs. I have seen more
>lives, bands, marriages, and great minds ruined by drugs, (and some of
>them prescribed drugs), than almost any other single factor.

>
>DCEvidently not the atheists....

DC

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>So, Don, who decides what morals are taught? And 'me' isn't a fair answer,
>though I know that's what you'd prefer.

>
>TCB

>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>>
>>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our bright
>>
>>>young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a campaign to
>>
>>> influence the schools and school systems and the teaching colleges in
>>
>>>a big way.

>>
>>There's more to it than this. Part of it is also the cult of IQ and the
>>
>>separation of values reasoning and virtue from cognition.

>>
>>It's all intelligence, it's all cognition.

>>
>>But because we have been told we want a values-free education and are
>>foolish enough to accept the illusion of detached neutrality, we separate
>>out certain functions of the mind and call them intelligence while
>>dismissing others as "not intelligence" but wisdom, virtue, honor,
>>decency, etc. So we end up with Teddy Roosevelt's famous comment
>>coming true in our lifetimes:

>>
>>"To educate a man in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to society."

>>
>>Today, the very idea of society, as a system of shared values and assumed
>>decencies is seen as laughable by a lot of people, while "intelligence"
>is

>>
>>treated by the quasi-educated as silicone is treated by porn stars.
>>

>>I don't like psychiatry much more than you do Bill (though I think there
>>is a place for it in extreme cases where treatment has prevented suicides
>>and murders) but it is not the source of the culture we live in. It is
>a
>>symptom not a cause.
>>
>>I am with you on drugs though. I HATE drugs. I have seen more
>>lives, bands, marriages, and great minds ruined by drugs, (and some of
>>them prescribed drugs), than almost any other single factor.
>>
>>DC
>Hi Greg,

I'd recommend sticking with Windows XP if you can. There are kernel functions in XP that are missing in Windows 2000, and this could pose a problem for you either now or as I work on a newer build of the driver.

All the best,

Mike

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>oh, and yes.. you will have to use the XP drivers.

>

>AA

>

>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message

>news:478ae483\$1@linux...

>> I've heard of 2 ppl that tried, one with some successes but it's been

a

>> while (over 2 or 3 years ago) and I don't recall who. I guess the worst

>> you can do it try, but I sure like XP a lot better (over 2k in general)

if

>> you have the option, and you'll be in better company if things don't go

>> well at some point and you need help.

>>

>> AA

>>

>>

>> "Gregb" <funkykeys1@verizon.net> wrote in message news:478ae017\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> "Gregb" <funkykeys1@verizon.net> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>Is anyone using Windows 2000 successfully? If so, did you install the
xp

>>> drivers?
>>>>Thanks!
>>>
>>>
>>> Anyone?

>>
>>
>
>I have a bunch of sessions that I recorded in Paris that I want to work on in Pro Tools LE. Is there an easy (OK- relatively) easy way to convert the .paf-.wav, and/or the actual sessions? Thanks! -Jim Rosenthal, Dallas, TX (past Ensoniq and EMU rep)"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:
Kim any other suggestions

>
>
>Be aware that Kim W, DeeJ and myself have all had these boards fail on us...
>
>They work great... while they work. ;o)
>
>Cheers,
>Kim.

>
>"jim drago" <jamesd@prospectlk12.or.us> wrote:
>>
>>Thank you for your responses so far. I am now looking for a K8NS mobo. Next
>>? What is a good processor with this mobo? What is a good video card, I'll
>>be using 1 HP w2007 to start maybe add one I more later. Good PS. and good
>>rack mountable case. Sorry for so many ?'s Jim
>Thanks Aaron/Mike.
I will buy another copy of XP and go from there. I just happened to have a copy of 2000 laying around so thought I'd ask.

Greg

"Mike Audet" <mike@...> wrote:

>
>Hi Greg,
>
>I'd recommend sticking with Windows XP if you can. There are kernel functions
>in XP that are missing in Windows 2000, and this could pose a problem for
>you either now or as I work on a newer build of the driver.
>
>All the best,

>
>Mike
>
>
>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>oh, and yes.. you will have to use the XP drivers.
>>
>>AA
>>
>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>news:478ae483\$1@linux...
>>> I've heard of 2 ppl that tried, one with some successes but it's been
>a
>>> while (over 2 or 3 years ago) and I don't recall who. I guess the worst
>
>>> you can do it try, but I sure like XP a lot better (over 2k in general)
>if
>>> you have the option, and you'll be in better company if things don't
go
>
>>> well at some point and you need help.
>>>
>>> AA
>>>
>>>
>>> "Gregb" <funkykeys1@verizon.net> wrote in message news:478ae017\$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> "Gregb" <funkykeys1@verizon.net> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>Is anyone using Windows 2000 successfully? If so, did you install the
>xp
>>>> drivers?
>>>>>Thanks!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Anyone?
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>Good answer, Don, and a fine defense of your argument that 'morals' and 'value
reasoning' should be part of (publicly funded, with my tax dollars) education.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>

>Evidently not the atheists....
>
>DC
>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>So, Don, who decides what morals are taught? And 'me' isn't a fair answer,
>>though I know that's what you'd prefer.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our bright
>>>>
>>>>young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a campaign
to
>>>>
>>>> influence the schools and school systems and the teaching colleges
in
>>>>
>>>>a big way.
>>>>
>>>>There's more to it than this. Part of it is also the cult of IQ and the
>>>>
>>>>separation of values reasoning and virtue from cognition.
>>>>
>>>>It's all intelligence, it's all cognition.
>>>>
>>>>But because we have been told we want a values-free education and are
>>>>foolish enough to accept the illusion of detached neutrality, we separate
>>>>out certain functions of the mind and call them intelligence while
>>>>dismissing others as "not intelligence" but wisdom, virtue, honor,
>>>>decency, etc. So we end up with Teddy Roosevelt's famous comment
>>>>coming true in our lifetimes:
>>>>
>>>>"To educate a man in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to
society."
>>>>
>>>>Today, the very idea of society, as a system of shared values and assumed
>>>>decencies is seen as laughable by a lot of people, while "intelligence"
>>is
>>>>
>>>>treated by the quasi-educated as silicone is treated by porn stars.
>>>>
>>>>I don't like psychiatry much more than you do Bill (though I think there

>>>is a place for it in extreme cases where treatment has prevented suicides
>>>and murders) but it is not the source of the culture we live in. It is
>>a
>>>symptom not a cause.
>>>
>>>I am with you on drugs though. I HATE drugs. I have seen more
>>>lives, bands, marriages, and great minds ruined by drugs, (and some of
>>>them prescribed drugs), than almost any other single factor.
>>>
>>>DC
>>
>So, you really do have nothing to offer?

Are there no civic virtues to be taught? Or is it true that all morals
must derive from belief in absolutes?

DC

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>
>Good answer, Don, and a fine defense of your argument that 'morals' and
'value
>reasoning' should be part of (publicly funded, with my tax dollars) education.
>
>
>TCB
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>
>>Evidently not the atheists....
>>
>>DC
>>
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>So, Don, who decides what morals are taught? And 'me' isn't a fair answer,
>>>though I know that's what you'd prefer.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our bright

>>>>
>>>>>young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a campaign
>to
>>>>
>>>>> influence the schools and school systems and the teaching colleges
>in
>>>>
>>>>>a big way.
>>>>
>>>>There's more to it than this. Part of it is also the cult of IQ and
the
>>>>
>>>>separation of values reasoning and virtue from cognition.
>>>>
>>>>It's all intelligence, it's all cognition.
>>>>
>>>>But because we have been told we want a values-free education and are
>>>>foolish enough to accept the illusion of detached neutrality, we separate
>>>>out certain functions of the mind and call them intelligence while
>>>>dismissing others as "not intelligence" but wisdom, virtue, honor,
>>>>decency, etc. So we end up with Teddy Roosevelt's famous comment
>>>>coming true in our lifetimes:
>>>>
>>>>"To educate a man in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to
>society."
>>>>
>>>>Today, the very idea of society, as a system of shared values and assumed
>>>>decencies is seen as laughable by a lot of people, while "intelligence"
>>>is
>>>>
>>>>treated by the quasi-educated as silicone is treated by porn stars.
>>>>
>>>>I don't like psychiatry much more than you do Bill (though I think there
>>>>is a place for it in extreme cases where treatment has prevented suicides
>>>>and murders) but it is not the source of the culture we live in. It
is
>>>a
>>>>symptom not a cause.
>>>>
>>>>I am with you on drugs though. I HATE drugs. I have seen more
>>>>lives, bands, marriages, and great minds ruined by drugs, (and some of
>>>>them prescribed drugs), than almost any other single factor.
>>>>
>>>>DC
>>>
>>
>Hey Bill,

I realize you have strong personal opinions, or more accurately strong visceral reactions to the psychiatric profession. I happen to agree that brain meds are vastly over prescribed. However, my father is a (retired) counseling psychology Ph.D. and my mother is a (ditto) retired high school counselor. Trust me, there is no vast conspiracy in the head shrinking community to get everyone medicated. The _is_ an easily understood and contemptible conspiracy by drug companies to get their drugs prescribed so they make money, but the idea that there is some back room cabal of shrinks trying to get us all on Zoloft? It just ain't so.

In addition, there are a number of situations where it is stone cold necessary to have people highly skilled and trained to deal with personality disorders. For example, one of my good friends and fave golfing buddy (he's a freaking four handicap, which is incredibly annoying) makes a fair bit of his living doing assessments of sex offenders who are up for parole or who have served their sentence. Sex offenders are notoriously recidivist criminals but (so far) the law doesn't allow them to be held forever. My friend's job is to assess those up for parole to make his best judgment about which prisoners are unlikely to be a danger to others if released, and also to create programs of therapy in the hope that those who have served their full sentence (or are paroled) can be prevented from committing further crimes. It agonizing, difficult work, and in addition to doing absolutely the best job he can (sometimes involving drug therapies) he has a wonderful family and two adorable bloodhounds. To paint him, and the many thousands of other well meaning head shrinkers, with a single brush as essentially evil scientists is just unfair.

Again, this is obviously a personal thing for you, and that's fine, but keep the rhetoric respectful of the people who do the best job they can.

TCB

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our bright

>young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a campaign to

> influence the schools and school systems and the teaching colleges in

>a big way.

>

>In the '50s at an annual convention, the head of American Psychiatric

>Association publicly declared their new goal of creating a "Value

>Neutral Society". Their aim was to blur and eradicate the distinction

>between right and wrong.

>

>They knew that the sure way to change society was by influencing the

>children. Psychiatrists have gradually introduced to our schools the

>mass drugging of children and even infants (approximately 8 million on

>Ritalin type drugs), Outcome Based Education (doesn't matter how much or

>how well children learn, just that they felt good about it) and the rest

>of their psuchobabble notions of how people should think and behave.

>

>Who was the most influential proponent of the "drug culture"? Not

>coincidentally, a psychologist and college professor, Dr. Timothy Leary.

>

>When you hear someone derided for being "judgmental", that is the

>influence of psychiatric double speak. Smart, ethical people used to be

>regarded as showing "good judgment", but now that positive attribute of

>being able to rightly judge people and situations has been slyly skewed

>into a bad thing. I'm sure you have noticed other examples of how

>illogical psychiatric concepts have replaced good reasoning.

>

>When you look around our society and see the delineation between right

>and wrong, logical and illogical, smart and stupid being blurred it is

>no accident. Look to the only group who has for over 50 years had that

>as their stated aim: psychiatry and psychology.

>

>We can fix our schools but we must first recognize the source of the

>problem and erase its influence or it will only get worse. Our children

>are our responsibility.

>

>

>rick wrote:

>> yup, a bunch of egotistical numbnuts. it astounds me the level of non

>> educated college graduates we're churning out...with pride.

>>

>>

>> On Sun, 13 Jan 2008 01:29:11 -0800, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> I think you got it, Don. Psychologists pretending to know something

>>> decided

>>> that discipline and competion were harmful to children's mental health.

>>>

>>> S

>>>

>>>

>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4789a15e\$1@linux...

>>>> Self esteem replaced achievement.

>>>>

>>>>

>>I have plenty of ideas about what should be taught, Don, but I didn't make the 'morals are part of cognition and have to be taught in schools' argument. You did. Defend it or say you mispoke. So, again, who picks the morals to be taught?

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>So, you really do have nothing to offer?

>

>Are there no civic virtues to be taught? Or is it true that all morals

>must derive from belief in absolutes?

>

>

>

>DC

>

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>Good answer, Don, and a fine defense of your argument that 'morals' and

>'value

>>reasoning' should be part of (publicly funded, with my tax dollars) education.

>>

>>

>>TCB

>>

>>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>Evidently not the atheists....

>>>

>>>DC

>>>

>>>

>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>So, Don, who decides what morals are taught? And 'me' isn't a fair answer,

>>>>though I know that's what you'd prefer.

>>>>

>>>>TCB

>>>>

>>>>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>>>>>>Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our bright

>>>>>

>>>>>young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a campaign
>>to
>>>>>
>>>>> influence the schools and school systems and the teaching colleges
>>in
>>>>>
>>>>>a big way.
>>>>>
>>>>>There's more to it than this. Part of it is also the cult of IQ and
>the
>>>>>
>>>>>separation of values reasoning and virtue from cognition.
>>>>>
>>>>>It's all intelligence, it's all cognition.
>>>>>
>>>>>But because we have been told we want a values-free education and are
>>>>>foolish enough to accept the illusion of detached neutrality, we separate
>>>>>out certain functions of the mind and call them intelligence while
>>>>>dismissing others as "not intelligence" but wisdom, virtue, honor,
>>>>>decency, etc. So we end up with Teddy Roosevelt's famous comment
>>>>>coming true in our lifetimes:
>>>>>
>>>>>"To educate a man in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to
>>society."
>>>>>
>>>>>Today, the very idea of society, as a system of shared values and assumed
>>>>>decencies is seen as laughable by a lot of people, while "intelligence"
>>>>>is
>>>>>
>>>>>treated by the quasi-educated as silicone is treated by porn stars.
>>>>>
>>>>>I don't like psychiatry much more than you do Bill (though I think there
>>>>>is a place for it in extreme cases where treatment has prevented suicides
>>>>>and murders) but it is not the source of the culture we live in. It
>is
>>>>a
>>>>>symptom not a cause.
>>>>>
>>>>>I am with you on drugs though. I HATE drugs. I have seen more
>>>>>lives, bands, marriages, and great minds ruined by drugs, (and some
>of
>>>>>them prescribed drugs), than almost any other single factor.
>>>>>
>>>>>DC
>>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>So, again, who picks the morals to be taught?

>

>TCB

Simple enough. Those involved in the conversation.

Do you have something to offer? Because I can assure you, the conversation is not going away.

Would you derive morals from Hobbes' natural law reasoning?
Social contract theory? Natural selection?

Tell me how you would join the conversation.

After all, it's up to us innit?

Again, have anything to offer?

DCJamie,

As you can tell I feel strongly about this subject, but I do also appreciate your humor about it.

Indulge me in this and ask yourself this question: Could or would I prescribe a drug as powerful as crystal meth to a 12 year old boy to make him more tractable in school?

Jamie K wrote:

>

> Kids have little choice when adults conspire to do EVIL. For example, I
> was subjected to the EVILS of orthodontics! Hauled into a small room
> against my will and tortured with small instruments wielded by sadists.
> Cleverly painful devices were attached to my teeth and wires were
> tightened periodically to keep my teeth in line. Four perfectly good
> teeth were yanked out during the multi-year program of abuse. Drugs were
> used, but never enough. Even after all that, my teeth never admitted
> anything, not even name, rank or serial number.

>

> Granted, now I have straight teeth, but still!

>

> I'm pretty sure the evils of the world can be rightly blamed on
> orthodontists. Millions of kids were subjected to this, and also some
> adults. It is NO ACCIDENT and VERY EVIL. :^)

>

> Meanwhile I have observed a few psychologists and psychiatrists helping
> people straighten out their lives. Not always successfully, there is
> much yet to learn. Just as we will someday find better ways to
> straighten teeth. But I have seen good things happen with the help of

> caring people who seem to be trying to help as best they know how. Some
> prescribing drugs, (our knowledge of brain chemistry and psych drugs
> still seems to be at a fairly experimental stage, I'll give you that),
> and some not.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> Bill L wrote:
>> Sarah, It's hard to confront evil. Sometimes evil people smile and
>> laugh and seem like,they are your friend. But truly evil actions are
>> not done by accident. Can you think of any word other than "evil" for
>> drugging 8 million helpless and innocent children with a harmful and
>> very powerful narcotic? It is NO ACCIDENT and it is VERY EVIL.
>>
>> Confront it.
>>
>> Sarah wrote:
>>> Now, settle down, Bill . . . don't go all Tom Cruise on us.
>>> "Battlefield Earth" was just a book and a movie . . . the
>>> psych-iatrists/ologists are not evil aliens from another galaxy . . .
>>> or ARE they? (dunt dunt duuunnnnn . . .) Psychs . . . Psychlos .
>>> . . hmmm.
>>>
>>> I admire that Scientology usually demands specifics and personal
>>> observation, but when it comes to psychiatry, it's all broad
>>> generalities. I know a fair number of psychs through my job, and if
>>> there's an evil conspiracy to ruin humanity, I think someone forgot
>>> to clue them in. Now, the pharmaceutical companies . . . that's
>>> another story.
>>>
>>> But thanks for the nice compliment. I should tell you, though, that
>>> I'm not particularly young, and the fact that I can count spilled
>>> toothpicks at a glance doesn't make me bright.
>>>
>>> I'm an excellent driver.
>>>
>>> S
>>>
>>>
>>> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message
>>> news:478a535f\$1@linux...
>>>> Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our
>>>> bright young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a
>>>> campaign to influence the schools and school systems and the
>>>> teaching colleges in a big way.

>>>>

>>>> In the '50s at an annual convention, the head of American
>>>> Psychiatric Association publicly declared their new goal of creating
>>>> a "Value Neutral Society". Their aim was to blur and eradicate the
>>>> distinction between right and wrong.

>>>>

>>>> They knew that the sure way to change society was by influencing the
>>>> children. Psychiatrists have gradually introduced to our schools the
>>>> mass drugging of children and even infants (approximately 8 million
>>>> on Ritalin type drugs), Outcome Based Education (doesn't matter how
>>>> much or how well children learn, just that they felt good about it)
>>>> and the rest of their psuchobabble notions of how people should
>>>> think and behave.

>>>>

>>>> Who was the most influential proponent of the "drug culture"? Not
>>>> coincidentally, a psychologist and college professor, Dr. Timothy
>>>> Leary.

>>>>

>>>> When you hear someone derided for being "judgmental", that is the
>>>> influence of psychiatric double speak. Smart, ethical people used to
>>>> be regarded as showing "good judgment", but now that positive
>>>> attribute of being able to rightly judge people and situations has
>>>> been slyly skewed into a bad thing. I'm sure you have noticed other
>>>> examples of how illogical psychiatric concepts have replaced good
>>>> reasoning.

>>>>

>>>> When you look around our society and see the delineation between
>>>> right and wrong, logical and illogical, smart and stupid being
>>>> blurred it is no accident. Look to the only group who has for over
>>>> 50 years had that as their stated aim: psychiatry and psychology.

>>>>

>>>> We can fix our schools but we must first recognize the source of the
>>>> problem and erase its influence or it will only get worse. Our
>>>> children are our responsibility.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> rick wrote:

>>>>> yup, a bunch of egotistical numbnuts. it astounds me the level of non
>>>>> educated college graduates we're churning out...with pride.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> On Sun, 13 Jan 2008 01:29:11 -0800, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
>>>>> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>> I think you got it, Don. Psychologists pretending to know
>>>>>> something decided that discipline and competion were harmful to
>>>>>> children's mental health.

>>>>>>

>>>>> S
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message
>>>>> news:4789a15e\$1@linux...
>>>>>> Self esteem replaced achievement.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>
>>>I appreciate that everybody has their own viewpoint, but I have no
respect for a person who, in the name of help, puts a child on drugs
just to make them quiet.

And, yes, the drug companies are heavily to blame too. They are about as
slimy an industry as you can find. BUT they could get no where without
the "doctors" who prescribe these harmful drugs.

There was a time the medical profession swore by blood letting for just
about any illness. One day our civilization will look back at the mass
drugging of children (as well as adults) and wonder how the fuck people
could ever have been so barbaric.

I'll drop it now... until the next time!

TCB wrote:

> Hey Bill,
>
> I realize you have strong personal opinions, or more accurately strong visceral
> reactions to the psychiatric profession. I happen to agree that brain meds
> are vastly over prescribed. However, my father is a (retired) counseling
> psychology Ph.D. and my mother is a (ditto) retired high school counselor.
> Trust me, there is no vast conspiracy in the head shrinking community to
> get everyone medicated. The _is_ an easily understood and contemptible conspiracy
> by drug companies to get their drugs prescribed so they make money, but the
> idea that there is some back room cabal of shrinks trying to get us all on
> Zoloft? It just ain't so.
>
> In addition, there are a number of situations where it is stone cold necessary
> to have people highly skilled and trained to deal with personality disorders.
> For example, one of my good friends and fave golfing buddy (he's a freaking
> four handicap, which is incredibly annoying) makes a fair bit of his living
> doing assessments of sex offenders who are up for parole or who have served
> their sentence. Sex offenders are notoriously recidivist criminals but (so
> far) the law doesn't allow them to be held forever. My friend's job is to
> assess those up for parole to make his best judgment about which prisoners
> are unlikely to be a danger to others if released, and also to create programs
> of therapy in the hope that those who have served their full sentence (or
> are paroled) can be prevented from committing further crimes. It agonizing,

> difficult work, and in addition to doing absolutely the best job he can (sometimes
> involving drug therapies) he has a wonderful family and two adorable bloodhounds.
> To paint him, and the many thousands of other well meaning head shrinkers,
> with a single brush as essentially evil scientists is just unfair.
>
> Again, this is obviously a personal thing for you, and that's fine, but keep
> the rhetoric respectful of the people who do the best job they can.
>
> TCB
>
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our bright
>
>> young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a campaign to
>
>> influence the schools and school systems and the teaching colleges in
>
>> a big way.
>>
>> In the '50s at an annual convention, the head of American Psychiatric
>> Association publicly declared their new goal of creating a "Value
>> Neutral Society". Their aim was to blur and eradicate the distinction
>> between right and wrong.
>>
>> They knew that the sure way to change society was by influencing the
>> children. Psychiatrists have gradually introduced to our schools the
>> mass drugging of children and even infants (approximately 8 million on
>> Ritalin type drugs), Outcome Based Education (doesn't matter how much or
>
>> how well children learn, just that they felt good about it) and the rest
>
>> of their psuchobabble notions of how people should think and behave.
>>
>> Who was the most influential proponent of the "drug culture"? Not
>> coincidentally, a psychologist and college professor, Dr. Timothy Leary.
>>
>> When you hear someone derided for being "judgmental", that is the
>> influence of psychiatric double speak. Smart, ethical people used to be
>
>> regarded as showing "good judgment", but now that positive attribute of
>
>> being able to rightly judge people and situations has been slyly skewed
>
>> into a bad thing. I'm sure you have noticed other examples of how
>> illogical psychiatric concepts have replaced good reasoning.
>>
>> When you look around our society and see the delineation between right
>> and wrong, logical and illogical, smart and stupid being blurred it is

>> no accident. Look to the only group who has for over 50 years had that
>> as their stated aim: psychiatry and psychology.
>>
>> We can fix our schools but we must first recognize the source of the
>> problem and erase its influence or it will only get worse. Our children
>
>> are our responsibility.
>>
>>
>> rick wrote:
>>> yup, a bunch of egotistical numbnuts. it astounds me the level of non
>>> educated college graduates we're churning out...with pride.
>>>
>>>
>>> On Sun, 13 Jan 2008 01:29:11 -0800, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> I think you got it, Don. Psychologists pretending to know something
> decided
>>>> that discipline and competen were harmful to children's mental health.
>>>>
>>>> S
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4789a15e\$1@linux...
>>>>> Self esteem replaced achievement.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>On 15/1/08 8:11 AM, in article 478bc1fe\$1@linux, "Jim Rosenthal"
><jrosenthal@lpbenenergy.com> wrote:
>
> I have a bunch of sessions that I recorded in Paris that I want
> to work on in Pro Tools LE. Is there an easy (OK- relatively)
> easy way to convert the .paf-.wav, and/or the actual sessions?
> Thanks! -Jim Rosenthal, Dallas, TX (past Ensoniq and EMU rep)
Hi Jim.
Firstly, do a search for the Paf - wav converter, (someone on the NG may
have it), and do a batch convert.
Then you need to bounce each of the tracks from zero to individual files.
Then you can open a PT session and lay the files from zero and it should all
line up perfectly.
Best of luck.
Martin HHey Bill,

Passionate feelings are nothing to scoff at. There is plenty of room for
criticism of the medical industry as a whole and the drug economy in
particular and I agree with some of that criticism.

However, it would be unfair to broadly dismiss psychiatrists and psychologists as "evil." That would be absurd. It would be more fair to recognize that, while not perfect practitioners of perfectly understood science, they have dedicated years of study to be able to help people as best we know right now. And right now that includes therapy, drugs or both, for people who are struggling with mental illness.

Our current knowledge of mental health issues is, it seems to me, pretty young. We have much to learn. But attacking or scapegoating the doctors is not the way to improve things.

I've never had crystal meth so I can't appreciate your analogy there. But I'm not a fan of drug therapy unless there is no other effective avenue of treatment. Even then, much drug therapy is still at a "black box" stage where the usage is experimental, the results unspecific, and the side effects risky. The brain itself is also not well understood.

And yet I have seen psych drugs have an overall positive effect in the lives of people I know, and offer an avenue of hope. Continued research is important.

So I will respectfully disagree with your overall conclusion and characterization, while agreeing in various extents with some of your points.

Thanks for the appreciation of the humor, it really was a nightmare going to the orthodontist! :^)

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Bill L wrote:

> Jamie,
> As you can tell I feel strongly about this subject, but I do also
> appreciate your humor about it.
>
> Indulge me in this and ask yourself this question: Could or would I
> prescribe a drug as powerful as crystal meth to a 12 year old boy to
> make him more tractable in school?
>

> Jamie K wrote:

>>

>> Kids have little choice when adults conspire to do EVIL. For example,

>> I was subjected to the EVILS of orthodontics! Hauled into a small room
>> against my will and tortured with small instruments wielded by
>> sadists. Cleverly painful devices were attached to my teeth and wires
>> were tightened periodically to keep my teeth in line. Four perfectly
>> good teeth were yanked out during the multi-year program of abuse.
>> Drugs were used, but never enough. Even after all that, my teeth never
>> admitted anything, not even name, rank or serial number.
>>
>> Granted, now I have straight teeth, but still!
>>
>> I'm pretty sure the evils of the world can be rightly blamed on
>> orthodontists. Millions of kids were subjected to this, and also some
>> adults. It is NO ACCIDENT and VERY EVIL. :^)
>>
>> Meanwhile I have observed a few psychologists and psychiatrists
>> helping people straighten out their lives. Not always successfully,
>> there is much yet to learn. Just as we will someday find better ways
>> to straighten teeth. But I have seen good things happen with the help
>> of caring people who seem to be trying to help as best they know how.
>> Some prescribing drugs, (our knowledge of brain chemistry and psych
>> drugs still seems to be at a fairly experimental stage, I'll give you
>> that), and some not.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> Bill L wrote:
>>> Sarah, It's hard to confront evil. Sometimes evil people smile and
>>> laugh and seem like they are your friend. But truly evil actions are
>>> not done by accident. Can you think of any word other than "evil" for
>>> drugging 8 million helpless and innocent children with a harmful and
>>> very powerful narcotic? It is NO ACCIDENT and it is VERY EVIL.
>>>
>>> Confront it.
>>>
>>> Sarah wrote:
>>>> Now, settle down, Bill . . . don't go all Tom Cruise on us.
>>>> "Battlefield Earth" was just a book and a movie . . . the
>>>> psych-iatrists/ologists are not evil aliens from another galaxy . .
>>>> . or ARE they? (dunt dunt duuunnnnn . . .) Psychs . . . Psychlos
>>>> . . . hmmm.
>>>>
>>>> I admire that Scientology usually demands specifics and personal
>>>> observation, but when it comes to psychiatry, it's all broad
>>>> generalities. I know a fair number of psychs through my job, and if
>>>> there's an evil conspiracy to ruin humanity, I think someone forgot

>>>> to clue them in. Now, the pharmaceutical companies . . . that's
>>>> another story.
>>>>
>>>> But thanks for the nice compliment. I should tell you, though, that
>>>> I'm not particularly young, and the fact that I can count spilled
>>>> toothpicks at a glance doesn't make me bright.
>>>>
>>>> I'm an excellent driver.
>>>>
>>>> S
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:478a535f\$1@linux...
>>>>> Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our
>>>>> bright young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a
>>>>> campaign to influence the schools and school systems and the
>>>>> teaching colleges in a big way.
>>>>>
>>>>> In the '50s at an annual convention, the head of American
>>>>> Psychiatric Association publicly declared their new goal of
>>>>> creating a "Value Neutral Society". Their aim was to blur and
>>>>> eradicate the distinction between right and wrong.
>>>>>
>>>>> They knew that the sure way to change society was by influencing
>>>>> the children. Psychiatrists have gradually introduced to our
>>>>> schools the mass drugging of children and even infants
>>>>> (approximately 8 million on Ritalin type drugs), Outcome Based
>>>>> Education (doesn't matter how much or how well children learn, just
>>>>> that they felt good about it) and the rest of their psuchobabble
>>>>> notions of how people should think and behave.
>>>>>
>>>>> Who was the most influential proponent of the "drug culture"? Not
>>>>> coincidentally, a psychologist and college professor, Dr. Timothy
>>>>> Leary.
>>>>>
>>>>> When you hear someone derided for being "judgmental", that is the
>>>>> influence of psychiatric double speak. Smart, ethical people used
>>>>> to be regarded as showing "good judgment", but now that positive
>>>>> attribute of being able to rightly judge people and situations has
>>>>> been slyly skewed into a bad thing. I'm sure you have noticed other
>>>>> examples of how illogical psychiatric concepts have replaced good
>>>>> reasoning.
>>>>>
>>>>> When you look around our society and see the delineation between
>>>>> right and wrong, logical and illogical, smart and stupid being
>>>>> blurred it is no accident. Look to the only group who has for over
>>>>> 50 years had that as their stated aim: psychiatry and psychology.

>>>>>
>>>>> We can fix our schools but we must first recognize the source of
>>>>> the problem and erase its influence or it will only get worse. Our
>>>>> children are our responsibility.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> rick wrote:
>>>>> yup, a bunch of egotistical numbnuts. it astounds me the level of
>>>>> non
>>>>> educated college graduates we're churning out...with pride.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On Sun, 13 Jan 2008 01:29:11 -0800, "Sarah"
>>>>> <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> I think you got it, Don. Psychologists pretending to know
>>>>>> something decided that discipline and competition were harmful to
>>>>>> children's mental health.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> S
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:4789a15e\$1@linux...
>>>>>> Self esteem replaced achievement.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"jim drago" <jamesd@prospect.k12.or.us> wrote:
>Kim any other suggestions

These aren't my suggestions, and I haven't used one, but:

Asrock AM2NF3-VSTA

There was another recommended but I don't seem to have a link here...

Cheers,
Kim.Don,

Thad asked a question, and you did your typical turn it on the asker, instead of just answering.

Chuck

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>So, again, who picks the morals to be taught?
>>
>>TCB
>
>
>Simple enough. Those involved in the conversation.
>
>Do you have something to offer? Because I can assure you, the
>conversation is not going away.
>
>Would you derive morals from Hobbes' natural law reasoning?
>Social contract theory? Natural selection?
>
>Tell me how you would join the conversation.
>
>After all, it's up to us innit?
>
>Again, have anything to offer?
>
>DC
>Those who engage the conversation, will pick the things that will
be taught.

There is no other answer.

There may still be common ground enough for a set of virtues to
be agreed upon. I certainly hope so. But, nothing I think will establish
who
does the choosing, and no matter what I say, I will be wrong because it
is a conversation, not an opinion poll.

Right now, millions are opting out of public education because of this
very issue. Christians, Muslims, Scientologists, Jews, all have their own
school systems for this very reason, and now the public school teachers
must often try to teach in a war zone because young people are raised
without morals and parents so often. Many people think it is time for
moral education to re enter public schools.

Which set of morals?

Ours. We decide. Those who participate, that is.

But mark my words, the conversation will occur with or without us.

DC

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>
>Don,
>
>Thad asked a question, and you did your typical turn it on the asker, instead
>of just answering.
>
>Chuck
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>So, again, who picks the morals to be taught?
>>>
>>>TCB
>>
>>
>>Simple enough. Those involved in the conversation.
>>
>>Do you have something to offer? Because I can assure you, the
>>conversation is not going away.
>>
>>Would you derive morals from Hobbes' natural law reasoning?
>>Social contract theory? Natural selection?
>>
>>Tell me how you would join the conversation.
>>
>>After all, it's up to us innit?
>>
>>Again, have anything to offer?
>>
>>DC
>>
>Obfuscate all you want, you're digging a hole and hanging curtains. There's
no conversation here, just you being mysterious and vague.

Chuck

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>
>Those who engage the conversation, will pick the things that will
>be taught.
>
>There is no other answer.
>
>There may still be common ground enough for a set of virtues to
>be agreed upon. I certainly hope so. But, nothing I think will establish
>who
>does the choosing, and no matter what I say, I will be wrong because it

>is a conversation, not an opinion poll.
>
>Right now, millions are opting out of public education because of this
>very issue. Christians, Muslims, Scientologists, Jews, all have their own
>school systems for this very reason, and now the public school teachers
>must often try to teach in a war zone because young people are raised
>without morals and parents so often. Many people think it is time for
>moral education to re enter public schools.
>
>Which set of morals?
>
>Ours. We decide. Those who participate, that is.
>
>But mark my words, the conversation will occur with or without us.
>
>DC
>
>"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:
>>
>>Don,
>>
>>Thad asked a question, and you did your typical turn it on the asker, instead
>>of just answering.
>>
>>Chuck
>>
>>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>So, again, who picks the morals to be taught?
>>>>
>>>>TCB
>>>
>>>
>>>Simple enough. Those involved in the conversation.
>>>
>>>Do you have something to offer? Because I can assure you, the
>>>conversation is not going away.
>>>
>>>Would you derive morals from Hobbes' natural law reasoning?
>>>Social contract theory? Natural selection?
>>>
>>>Tell me how you would join the conversation.
>>>
>>>After all, it's up to us innit?
>>>
>>>Again, have anything to offer?
>>>

>>>DC

>>>

>>

>I think there is common ground. I think our traditions provide us with a set of behaviors we should expect of each other.

Richard Dawkins evidently agrees.

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/7136682.stm

The truth is, I do not know which morals will be selected, or should be because I believe in a secular, (not secularist!) government and those choices are the product of a people, not a person.

How would you teach morals in grade school? Should we be doing this?

Well, I think so, and I think there is enough common ground to do so

agree?

DC

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>

>Obfuscate all you want, you're digging a hole and hanging curtains. There's
>no conversation here, just you being mysterious and vague.

>

>Chuck

>

>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>>

>>Those who engage the conversation, will pick the things that will
>>be taught.

>>

>>There is no other answer.

>>

>>There may still be common ground enough for a set of virtues to
>>be agreed upon. I certainly hope so. But, nothing I think will establish
>>who

>>does the choosing, and no matter what I say, I will be wrong because it
>>is a conversation, not an opinion poll.

>>

>>Right now, millions are opting out of public education because of this
>>very issue. Christians, Muslims, Scientologists, Jews, all have their
own

>>school systems for this very reason, and now the public school teachers
>>must often try to teach in a war zone because young people are raised
>>without morals and parents so often. Many people think it is time for

>>moral education to re enter public schools.
>>
>>Which set of morals?
>>
>>Ours. We decide. Those who participate, that is.
>>
>>But mark my words, the conversation will occur with or without us.
>>
>>DC
>>
>>"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Don,
>>>
>>>Thad asked a question, and you did your typical turn it on the asker,
instead
>>>of just answering.
>>>
>>>Chuck
>>>
>>>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>So, again, who picks the morals to be taught?
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Simple enough. Those involved in the conversation.
>>>>>
>>>>>Do you have something to offer? Because I can assure you, the
>>>>>conversation is not going away.
>>>>>
>>>>>Would you derive morals from Hobbes' natural law reasoning?
>>>>>Social contract theory? Natural selection?
>>>>>
>>>>>Tell me how you would join the conversation.
>>>>>
>>>>>After all, it's up to us innit?
>>>>>
>>>>>Again, have anything to offer?
>>>>>
>>>>>DC
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>
>Now then, here we have the DC rhetorical and debating style at its simplest
and purest. Or rather half of it. There's pit bull DC who will argue anything

to the bitter end and provoke the other party at every turn. Then there is, grandfatherly DC (this one) who speaks in generalities, answers questions with questions, and makes swooping appeals to open discussion and earnest sharing of ideas. Grandfatherly DC shows up in two situations, a) when DC has provoked the other party into spittle jetting rage ('Now _look_ at what you're doing, tsk tsk') or b) when he's caught dead to rights. There's also the convenient chopping up of what other people write to avoid discussing anything he doesn't want to discuss.

In any case, you missed a chance to make a good, or at least your best, argument here. You said morals, wisdom, and decency need to be taught alongside 'intelligence' and I asked who got to choose the morals to be taught. Of course, that's an almost impossibly difficult question, because at some point someone is going to object to some of those morals. What you could have argued, to at least get some breathing space, is that whatever morals should be taught it shouldn't be that Frankfurt School relativism spouted by elite and effete east coast Ivy Leaguers like me, which is the status quo. That misrepresents both me and the status quo, but that's never stopped you before and it's the best argumentative out you had.

Now then, some parts of a good school curriculum have no moral component. There's not much ethical spin possible when dealing with the laws of thermodynamics or the Pythagorean Theorem. The satanist in Brooklyn, the maddrassah teacher in Peshawar, the Mormon home schooler in Provo, and the radical settler on the West Bank would all cheerfully agree that the speed of light is about 186,000 miles per second. So what we're really talking about is minimal social sciences (barely taught outside of college), history, and languages and literature. So then, if morals and decency are to be taught in public schools, I ask this time thrice, who gets to decide what is taught?

As a delectable carrot to draw out an answer I offer this. If you answer that question with any degree of thoughtfulness and thoroughness I will give you _my_ opinion. And that is the opinion of someone who attended public schools for twelve years, whose parents both spent their entire working lives in public education, and who attended a private college where I got to compare my education to students who graduated in some of the most elite private and public secondary schools in the world.

This isn't a 'conversation' it's a simple question. Of course you don't have to answer it, just don't pretend it's something other than what it is.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>So, again, who picks the morals to be taught?

>>

>>TCB

>

>

>Simple enough. Those involved in the conversation.

>

>Do you have something to offer? Because I can assure you, the conversation is not going away.

>

>Would you derive morals from Hobbes' natural law reasoning?

>Social contract theory? Natural selection?

>

>Tell me how you would join the conversation.

>

>After all, it's up to us innit?

>

>Again, have anything to offer?

>

>DC

>Now then, here we have the DC rhetorical and debating style at its simplest and purest. Or rather half of it. There's pit bull DC who will argue anything to the bitter end and provoke the other party at every turn. Then there is, grandfatherly DC (this one) who speaks in generalities, answers questions with questions, and makes swooping appeals to open discussion and earnest sharing of ideas. Grandfatherly DC shows up in two situations, a) when DC has provoked the other party into spittle jetting rage ('Now look at what you're doing, tsk tsk') or b) when he's caught dead to rights. There's also the convenient chopping up of what other people write to avoid discussing anything he doesn't want to discuss.

In any case, you missed a chance to make a good, or at least your best, argument here. You said morals, wisdom, and decency need to be taught alongside 'intelligence' and I asked who got to choose the morals to be taught. Of course, that's an almost impossibly difficult question, because at some point someone is going to object to some of those morals. What you could have argued, to at least get some breathing space, is that whatever morals should be taught it shouldn't be that Frankfurt School relativism spouted by elite and effete east coast Ivy Leaguers like me, which is the status quo. That misrepresents both me and the status quo, but that's never stopped you before and it's the best argumentative out you had.

Now then, some parts of a good school curriculum have no moral component. There's not much ethical spin possible when dealing with the laws of thermodynamics or the Pythagorean Theorem. The satanist in Brooklyn, the maddrassah teacher in Peshawar, the Mormon home schooler in Provo, and the radical settler on the West Bank would all cheerfully agree that the speed of light is about 186,000 miles per second. So what we're really talking about is minimal social sciences (barely taught outside of college), history, and languages and literature. So then, if morals and decency are to be taught in public schools, I ask

this time thrice, who gets to decide what is taught?

As a delectable carrot to draw out an answer I offer this. If you answer that question with any degree of thoughtfulness and thoroughness I will give you _my_ opinion. And that is the opinion of someone who attended public schools for twelve years, whose parents both spent their entire working lives in public education, and who attended a private college where I got to compare my education to students who graduated in some of the most elite private and public secondary schools in the world.

This isn't a 'conversation' it's a simple question. Of course you don't have to answer it, just don't pretend it's something other than what it is.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>So, again, who picks the morals to be taught?

>>

>>TCB

>

>

>Simple enough. Those involved in the conversation.

>

>Do you have something to offer? Because I can assure you, the
>conversation is not going away.

>

>Would you derive morals from Hobbes' natural law reasoning?

>Social contract theory? Natural selection?

>

>Tell me how you would join the conversation.

>

>After all, it's up to us innit?

>

>Again, have anything to offer?

>

>DC

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>Now then, here we have the DC rhetorical and debating style at its simplest
>and purest. Or rather half of it. There's pit bull DC who will argue anything
>to the bitter end and provoke the other party at every turn. Then there
is,

>grandfatherly DC (this one) who speaks in generalities, answers questions

>with questions, and makes swooping appeals to open discussion and earnest

>sharing of ideas. Grandfatherly DC shows up in two situations, a) when DC

>has provoked the other party into spittle jetting rage ('Now _look_ at what

>you're doing, tsk tsk') or b) when he's caught dead to rights. There's also
>the convenient chopping up of what other people write to avoid discussing
>anything he doesn't want to discuss.

This is supposed to be a substitute for content??

How about you? Proud member of the assholes (I'm not a nice guy!)
union? The list pedant, never missing a chance to display his knowledge?

You have to be kidding. Man I edit you to spare you some grief...

(grin)

>In any case, you missed a chance to make a good, or at least your best,
argument
>here. You said morals, wisdom, and decency need to be taught alongside 'intelligence'
>and I asked who got to choose the morals to be taught. Of course, that's
>an almost impossibly difficult question, because at some point someone is
>going to object to some of those morals.

Which of course is not at all the point.

It's not impossible, and it's not even very difficult. It is, however,
collaborative and you have contributed nothing. As usual.

Is there common ground? Can we agree on some basics?

>What you could have argued, to at
>least get some breathing space, is that whatever morals should be taught
>it shouldn't be that Frankfurt School relativism spouted by elite and effete
>east coast Ivy Leaguers like me, which is the status quo. That misrepresents
>both me and the status quo, but that's never stopped you before and it's
>the best argumentative out you had.

Nope. Don't give a damn about your relativism and neither will history.
This country is still a democracy, no matter how much that pisses you
off, and most people have a clear set of morals. They will contribute
where you will not. They will rule. You will not. You will hate them.
That will make you feel special about yourself...

>Now then, some parts of a good school curriculum have no moral component.
>There's not much ethical spin possible when dealing with the laws of thermodynamics

>or the Pythagorean Theorem. The satanist in Brooklyn, the maddrassah teacher
>in Peshawar, the Mormon home schooler in Provo, and the radical settler
on
>the West Bank would all cheerfully agree that the speed of light is about
>186,000 miles per second. So what we're really talking about is minimal
social
>sciences (barely taught outside of college), history, and languages and
literature.

You forgot Zoroastrianism and your friendly local Buddhist, not to
mention your fellow Flying Spaghetti Monster worshipers...

So, It's proven! Nothing can be done!! There can be no morals taught
in schools.

And you call this a position?

>So then, if morals and decency are to be taught in public schools, I ask
>this time thrice, who gets to decide what is taught?

Thrice, he said thrice!! Must be educated...

We the People, that's who. I just reject your thesis, out of hand,
that is it impossible to find common ground.

>As a delectable carrot to draw out an answer I offer this. If you answer
>that question with any degree of thoughtfulness and thoroughness I will
give
>you _my_ opinion. And that is the opinion of someone who attended public
>schools for twelve years, whose parents both spent their entire working
lives
>in public education, and who attended a private college where I got to compare
>my education to students who graduated in some of the most elite private
>and public secondary schools in the world.
>
>This isn't a 'conversation' it's a simple question. Of course you don't
have
>to answer it, just don't pretend it's something other than what it is.
>
>TCB

It's like asking who gets to elect the government. We do.

Do you see any common ground or not?

DCIn a discussion like this it's important to define the terms. In fact "morals" may not be the most suitable word.

"Moral" is derived from the Latin word "moralis" which means "usage, customs". Morals are rules of conduct accepted by a society or group and based on group experience. Morals change with the times and with different societies. For example to a person who works for his living it would be immoral to withhold the name of a person who stole. To a criminal it would be immoral to "rat him out".

The word "ethics" may be a more useful term. Ethics is based on logical thought, rather than customary accepted behavior. What action would be the greatest good.

For example sometimes a lie may be the most ethical way to handle a situation even though morally speaking it would be wrong to lie. George Washington must have had a hard life if he could really not tell a lie.

Anyway, my point is that people should learn to think logically with ethics, rather than just follow a moral code (although a moral code is better than nothing).

Here is a way to make an ethical decision (this comes from the writings of L Ron Hubbard):

Life could be said to be composed of 8 "dynamics" or "urges toward survival" as follows:

First Dynamic is the urge toward survival of self.

Second Dynamic is the urge toward survival through a) sex, and b) children and family

Third Dynamic is the urge toward survival through groups (one's country, school, company, this newsgroup, etc.)

Fourth is the the urge toward survival through mankind

Fifth is the urge toward survival through living things (animals, plants, etc.)

Sixth dynamic is the urge toward survival through the physical world: matter, energy, space, and time

Seventh is the urge toward survival through spirits

Eighth is the urge toward survival through god or infinity

To make an ethical choice just make sure it helps a majority of the 8 dynamics. An optimum survival choice would be one which benefits all dynamics. Optimum survival is toward infinite survival.

Ideally we should teach our children to think with ethics and to make their choices towards optimum survival. This will keep them from being hoodwinked by, for example, a gang's moral code of hating the police and other rival gangs.

Children need to be given tools for rational thought and logic, not fixed ideas and certainly not false data or unethical ideas. Individuality must be fostered, especially in any group activity.

DC wrote:

> Those who engage the conversation, will pick the things that will
> be taught.
>
> There is no other answer.
>
> There may still be common ground enough for a set of virtues to
> be agreed upon. I certainly hope so. But, nothing I think will establish
> who
> does the choosing, and no matter what I say, I will be wrong because it
> is a conversation, not an opinion poll.
>
> Right now, millions are opting out of public education because of this
> very issue. Christians, Muslims, Scientologists, Jews, all have their own
> school systems for this very reason, and now the public school teachers
> must often try to teach in a war zone because young people are raised
> without morals and parents so often. Many people think it is time for
> moral education to re enter public schools.
>
> Which set of morals?
>
> Ours. We decide. Those who participate, that is.
>
> But mark my words, the conversation will occur with or without us.
>
> DC
>
> "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:
>> Don,
>>
>> Thad asked a question, and you did your typical turn it on the asker, instead

>> of just answering.
>>
>> Chuck
>>
>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>> So, again, who picks the morals to be taught?
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>
>>> Simple enough. Those involved in the conversation.
>>>
>>> Do you have something to offer? Because I can assure you, the
>>> conversation is not going away.
>>>
>>> Would you derive morals from Hobbes' natural law reasoning?
>>> Social contract theory? Natural selection?
>>>
>>> Tell me how you would join the conversation.
>>>
>>> After all, it's up to us innit?
>>>
>>> Again, have anything to offer?
>>>
>>> DC
>>>
>FWIW, I have both versions of PAFWAVCONVERT (one that works on
98/ME and one that works on WINXP), so Jim, if you need them, send me an
e-mail at:

neil DOT henderson AT sbcglobal DOT net, and i'll send them to
you, no problem, since they were both free releases.

Neil

Martin Harrington <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>On 15/1/08 8:11 AM, in article 478bc1fe\$1@linux, "Jim Rosenthal"
><jrosenthal@lpbenenergy.com> wrote:
>
>>
>> I have a bunch of sessions that I recorded in Paris that I want
>> to work on in Pro Tools LE. Is there an easy (OK- relatively)
>> easy way to convert the .paf-.wav, and/or the actual sessions?
>> Thanks! -Jim Rosenthal, Dallas, TX (past Ensoniq and EMU rep)
>Hi Jim.
>Firstly, do a search for the Paf - wav converter, (someone on the NG may
>have it), and do a batch convert.

>Then you need to bounce each of the tracks from zero to individual files.
>Then you can open a PT session and lay the files from zero and it should
>all
>line up perfectly.
>Best of luck.
>Martin H
>>This country is still a democracy, no matter how much that pisses you
>off,

errrrr.....just one small point. This country is not a democracy and never has been. It is a representative republic with a bicameral legislature which was specifically created to protect minority rights from the tyranny majority rule, which is the essence of the definition of democracy. In this country, we do employ a democratic "method" wherein the those who are legally entitled to vote (the electorate) choose legislators who are, in turn, subject to the rules as set out in the constitution and interpreted by the courts.

Just a small point.....but perhaps important to some degree.

;o)

OK..now I'm gonna put on my flame suit and cover up."Morgan" <morganp@ntplx.net> wrote:

>Greetings !
>Some of you know of my involvement with:
><http://www.palmtreeotechnology.com/>
>
>Palmtree Technology will be Speaking at the META session @ Namm
>introducing a revolutionary new CODEC (Details on Palmtree site)
>
>If anyone is interested in attending - admission is FREE , seating is
>limited
>Please let me know :)
>
>Morgan
>Eastcoast Music Mall
>800-901-2001
>morganp@ntplx.net
>

Morgan-

I suspect everyone here on the NG would be very interested in Palmtree, from what I just read at the site.

-steve

for those who haven't checked it out, they claim a new compression method

that can maintain CD quality while reducing the file to half that of an mp3...In the case of selecting school standards it is essentially a democracy of the engaged. (that then has to play political football with the unengaged) In other words, the more you get involved the more say you have.

Over the last few years, I have been involved in a couple of local committees both city and county, and two things have impressed me:

It's actually quite easy to get involved and have your voice heard. (That doesn't mean anyone is listening of course...)

Those people serving in these roles tend to be good folks and not ideologues.

My point? Just as with school Science standards (and I am against the mandated teaching of either creationism or ID) those with a burden on the issue hold the conversation. There WILL be a conversation however, especially on the teaching of virtue to young people. Then, some consensus is formed, that hopefully will not upset either the militant secularists, nor the conservative theists too much (though neither side will get what they really want) and this is presented to the public and made into policy. Then the activists try to get "the bums" who passed this garbage all recalled and the policy nullified. They may succeed. If they do not, the policy stands. The one group that gets well and truly steamrollered are those who think the whole project is impossible.

It's not. Consensus is achievable.

And anyone who doesn't think that we have a real problem in our public schools is in deep denial.

DC

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>

>

>>This country is still a democracy, no matter how much that pisses you

>>off,

>

>errrrr.....just one small point. This country is not a democracy and
>never has been. It is a representative republic with a bicameral legislature
>which was specifically created to protect minority rights from the tyranny
>majority rule, which is the essence of the definition of democracy. In this
>country, we do employ a democratic "method" wherein the those who are legally

>entitled to vote (the electorate) choose legislators who are, in turn, subject
>to the rules as set out in the constitution and interpreted by the courts.
>
>
>Just a small point.....but perhaps important to some degree.
>
>;o)
>
>OK..now I'm gonna put on my flame suit and cover up.
>
>If you have Paris3, you can do these things inside the program with
"Render track to disk" and then export the file(s) as "Audio object" or
"Stereo file" in wave format.

Erling

On 15 Jan 2008 07:11:42 +1000, "Jim Rosenthal"
<jrosenthal@lpbenergy.com> wrote:

>
>I have a bunch of sessions that I recorded in Paris that I want
>to work on in Pro Tools LE. Is there an easy (OK- relatively)
>easy way to convert the .paf-.wav, and/or the actual sessions?
>Thanks! -Jim Rosenthal, Dallas, TX (past Ensoniq and EMU rep)great...dumb but sane...is that
marketable?

On Mon, 14 Jan 2008 04:38:06 -0800, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
wrote:

>Smarter? Naaa. Loonier maybe. If you were loonier you would have thought
>of that.

>
>S
>
>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:2mamo3hjie0huv008c9bbq55efk88mc94r@4ax.com...
>> and if i were smarter i would have thought of that...
>>

>> On Sun, 13 Jan 2008 03:16:51 -0800, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
>> wrote:

>>
>>>"Ignoransk is blisk" - Popeye
>>>
>>>S
>>>
>>>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message

>>>news:32qjo3tacag3k1niba4n0sdgo18aafjb5v@4ax.com...
>>>> but they're happy...afterall ignorance is bliss.
>>>>
>>>> On 13 Jan 2008 14:09:17 +1000, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>You are spot on. Our educational system started to decline in the late
>>>>>>'60s and has never recovered
>>>>>>
>>>>>>In analyzing a changing trend in a statistic, such as the decline in
>>>>>>the
>>>>>>
>>>>>>quality of the US school system, what you must do is look just BEFORE
>>>>>>the change occurred to find what caused it. What changed in the US
>>>>>>school system that has caused the drastic reduction in results?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Discuss please...
>>>>>
>>>>>Taking the emphasis off competition, pass/ fail grading and passing
>>>>>students
>>>>>
>>>>>along without them being able to accomplish the coursework.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>
>That is the easiest way to go. Select all tracks then render to disk, then
export. I don't know of anything else that will capture all the edits, and
there's no way I know of to get the actual project to the PT platform

Chuck

erlilo <erling.lovik@lyse.net> wrote:

>If you have Paris3, you can do these things inside the program with
>"Render track to disk" and then export the file(s) as "Audio object" or
>"Stereo file" in wave format.

>

>Erling

>

>On 15 Jan 2008 07:11:42 +1000, "Jim Rosenthal"

><jrosenthal@lpbenergy.com> wrote:

>

>>

>>I have a bunch of sessions that I recorded in Paris that I want

>>to work on in Pro Tools LE. Is there an easy (OK- relatively)

>>easy way to convert the .paf-.wav, and/or the actual sessions?

>>Thanks! -Jim Rosenthal, Dallas, TX (past Ensoniq and EMU rep)Bill,

I have no trouble "confronting" evil or anything else you want me to

confront. I just don't like broad generalities, and you shouldn't either, since dealing in broad generalities is a characteristic Mr Hubbard has assigned to the antisocial personality.

I think it works like this:

1. Drug companies make drugs. Sometimes they even make up diseases to market the drugs. (Restless leg syndrome? Please . . .) Sometimes they even neglect to inform us about the risks and side effects.

2. People have aches, pains, and problems. They want relief, and if they can get it from a pill, all the better. Much less work that way.

3. Doctors are under pressure to fix people's aches, pains, and problems, and if they can do it with a pill, all the better. Much less work that way.

See? It's a perfect kinky three-way relationship. No conspiracy, just people being their usual crazy selves.

But if you're going to have this be a big conspiracy, you better include the parents and teachers in on it. No one is forcing parents to drug their kids. I had a problem child, and I didn't drug him. The school wanted us to, and we said, "NO!" Children are all individual people who learn in different ways and at different rates, and I'm not going to drug him just because they can't figure how to teach him.

Some shrinks drug their patients, others don't. I'm not buying the big faceless EVIL. It's just the pharmaceutical-medical-patient triangle at work.

Many years ago, the American Psychiatric Association rejected and criticized Dianetics/Scientology, and ever since then the Church of Scientology has been following L. Ron's policy to attack the attackers, rather than defend the Church. The entire profession of psychiatry became "fair game." Is it possible that, as a loyal member of the COS, this decades old conflict is an element of your passionate feelings about psychs? Can you confront that possibility?

I agree philosophically about the use of psychiatric drugs on children (and adults for that matter), but broad generalities are just not at all persuasive or helpful.

Peace,

Sarah(tonin re-uptake inhibitor)

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:478b7089@linux...
> Sarah, It's hard to confront evil. Sometimes evil people smile and laugh

> and seem like,they are your friend. But truly evil actions are not done by
> accident. Can you think of any word other than "evil" for drugging 8
> million helpless and innocent children with a harmful and very powerful
> narcotic? It is NO ACCIDENT and it is VERY EVIL.
>
> Confront it.
>
> Sarah wrote:
>> Now, settle down, Bill . . . don't go all Tom Cruise on us. "Battlefield
>> Earth" was just a book and a movie . . . the psych-iatrists/ologists are
>> not evil aliens from another galaxy . . . or ARE they? (dunt dunt
>> duuunnnnn . . .) Psychs . . . Psychlos . . . hmmm.
>>
>> I admire that Scientology usually demands specifics and personal
>> observation, but when it comes to psychiatry, it's all broad
>> generalities. I know a fair number of psychs through my job, and if
>> there's an evil conspiracy to ruin humanity, I think someone forgot to
>> clue them in. Now, the pharmaceutical companies . . . that's another
>> story.
>>
>> But thanks for the nice compliment. I should tell you, though, that I'm
>> not particularly young, and the fact that I can count spilled toothpicks
>> at a glance doesn't make me bright.
>>
>> I'm an excellent driver.
>>
>> S
>>
>>
>> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message
>> news:478a535f\$1@linux...
>>> Well done, class! Your answers are all correct, but as usual our bright
>>> young lady is most astute. In the '60s psychiatry started a campaign to
>>> influence the schools and school systems and the teaching colleges in a
>>> big way.
>>>
>>> In the '50s at an annual convention, the head of American Psychiatric
>>> Association publicly declared their new goal of creating a "Value
>>> Neutral Society". Their aim was to blur and eradicate the distinction
>>> between right and wrong.
>>>
>>> They knew that the sure way to change society was by influencing the
>>> children. Psychiatrists have gradually introduced to our schools the
>>> mass drugging of children and even infants (approximately 8 million on
>>> Ritalin type drugs), Outcome Based Education (doesn't matter how much or
>>> how well children learn, just that they felt good about it) and the rest
>>> of their psuchobabble notions of how people should think and behave.
>>>

>>> Who was the most influential proponent of the "drug culture"? Not
>>> coincidentally, a psychologist and college professor, Dr. Timothy Leary.
>>>
>>> When you hear someone derided for being "judgmental", that is the
>>> influence of psychiatric double speak. Smart, ethical people used to be
>>> regarded as showing "good judgment", but now that positive attribute of
>>> being able to rightly judge people and situations has been slyly skewed
>>> into a bad thing. I'm sure you have noticed other examples of how
>>> illogical psychiatric concepts have replaced good reasoning.
>>>
>>> When you look around our society and see the delineation between right
>>> and wrong, logical and illogical, smart and stupid being blurred it is
>>> no accident. Look to the only group who has for over 50 years had that
>>> as their stated aim: psychiatry and psychology.
>>>
>>> We can fix our schools but we must first recognize the source of the
>>> problem and erase its influence or it will only get worse. Our children
>>> are our responsibility.
>>>
>>>
>>> rick wrote:
>>>> yup, a bunch of egotistical numbnuts. it astounds me the level of non
>>>> educated college graduates we're churning out...with pride.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On Sun, 13 Jan 2008 01:29:11 -0800, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> I think you got it, Don. Psychologists pretending to know something
>>>>> decided that discipline and competen were harmful to children's
>>>>> mental health.
>>>>>
>>>>> S
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:4789a15e\$1@linux...
>>>>>> Self esteem replaced achievement.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>Hi everybody,

I'm redoing the acoustics of my room at home and I'm using suggestions for
bass traps and absorbers from Ethan Winer <http://www.ethanwiner.com/acoustics.html>

What I would need now is a software (Mac) to measure the nasty ringing frequencies
at a given spot so I can install absorbers and diffusers accurately.
I found this on the net <http://www.versiontracker.com/dyn/moreinfo/macosx/25161&vid=470175&mode=info>

Anyone familiar with this, or maybe other suggestions?
Any help in this domain is highly appreciated.

Best regards,

AbThis has been an interesting thread for me. We just took Jacob, our 10 year old son, out of an expensive private school that we couldn't afford because he has a multitude of "learning disorders" that they weren't equipped to deal with. Our final decision (for now, at least) is to home school him (and possibly his little sister depending on how the financial aide negotiations go) but we did investigate our local public elementary school. We met with the principle who, upon hearing about Jake's LD issues, asked "well, is he on medication?". We explained about both his biological parents being alcoholic/drug addicts and our trepidation about putting a kid with such a high genetic predisposition for addiction on highly addictive drugs such as Ritalin (which we just thought was bad speed back in the day) or Adderall (which is just another name for Dexidrine, which was GOOD speed back in the day). Her response was to look at my wife and say "Well, you don't leave home without your glasses, do you?". Sorry. Wrong answer for us. I should also mention that this school is a double magnet school with high enough average test scores to qualify for two "resource" (special ed) teachers. For over 400 kids. Plus, the expensive testing
