

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

==

Anybody=20

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

m

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

—

Marshall/Celestion custom-designed speakers (30W=20

"100"=20
logos, and is loaded with Celestion's =
highly-acclaimed
>&G12H-30=20
re-issue speakers.<

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Thu, 10 Aug 2006 19:21:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BR>>
>
>
>=20

</BLOCKQUOTE>
<DIV>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, =
and=20
you?
<A=20
=
href=3D"http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html">http://www.polesoft.com/refer=
..html </DIV></BLOCKQUOTE ></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0181_01C6D861.6C751E80--This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C6D86A.486E9EE0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Yes

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message =
news:450a3e45@linux...

Same rig.. you mean my pre and amp setup?

"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote in message =
news:450a3d8f@linux...

Aaron,

Matching amp/cabs are a no brainer but not always exactly right.

But the right speakers can sound like ass in a bad cab too.

These days we are required to get all the guitar sounds on every
CD when in a cover situation. It's harder than a one sound only =

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [DC](#) on Thu, 10 Aug 2006 19:26:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

band.

In general the smaller cabs have a harder time with the low end unless they're open back but then it's a little uncontrolled due to rear reflections, wall and stage resonance. If you end up=20 having to over eq to get it, it won't sound natural. I love to see = my=20 pants get wind torn from the low end as long as it's tight.

My buddy used to have that same rig if I'm not mistaken. He used Thiele cabs with it. It sounded really good. I'm=20 not sure it sounded as good as it could with the Thiele=20 cabs though. Nice to spread them out for stereo!

Good luck with your search,
Tom

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message = news:450a3340@linux...

Good info.... I like the idea of the smaller cab, and the lower = wattage=20

speaks, but I'm a little spooked at the total lack of specs = locatable on the=20

net about these guys... I don't want a cab that can't get anything = under say=20

90hz... that'd suck.

Hemp cone, eh?

I wonder if they'll just lay around eating Cheetos, watching TV = and react=20

sluggishly when I ask them to help around the house or get a job = :)

We agree on the alnico/ceramic debate. Like Alnico in a pickup.. = not so much=20 in a speaker.

AA

"DC" <dc@spammersatGC.com> wrote in message = news:450a2ec6\$1@linux...

>

> I think the cheaper cabinet will most likely involve the chinese
> made celestions which I have not heard good things about.

>

> You really need to hear a cabinet with your amp. There are
> big differences to be found.

>
>
> At last year's NAMM, I was really knocked out by the
> Tone Tubby hempcone speakers.
>
> They have 4x12's.
>
> <http://www.tonetubby.com/cabinet.htm>
>
> Very impressive and at reasonable levels too.
>
> BTW, I like the punch and clarity of ceramic magnet speakers
> much better than the over-rated AlNiCo. Much more dynamic.
>
> So, you could get a TT ceramic 4x12 for 1100 or so. I think
> they just sound amazing.
>
> DC
>
>
>
> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>I'm looking at picking up a 4x12 to club gig with. Anybody got =
experience
> to
>>share with me about these models??
>>Is there 'really' a \$1000 dollars worth of difference in tone =
from bottom
> to
>>top with them, is it mechanics (like say, casters and handles)?
>>I will be driving it with a 60wpc tube amp with a tube preamp =
front end.
> I
>>want the elusive 'brown sound' distortion and super clear =
cleans... which
>
>>the amp/preamp combo is certainly capable of giving me. It's the =
cabs that
>
>>suck on my current gear (2 unmatched 2x12's) - I wish to move to =
one=20
>>stereo
>
>>matched cab, and I'm not afraid to rewire it if that matters.
>>Many thanks in advance!
>>
>>
>><https://www.zzounds.com/item--MSHMG412A>

>>\$450.00 \$279.95
 >>Angled-front version.
 >>Power: 120 watts
 >>Impedance: 8 ohms
 >>Speakers: 4 x 12 in. Marshall/Celestion custom-designed speakers =
 (30W=20
 >>each)
 >>Dimensions (W x H x D): 26.4 x 26.4 x 14.0 in.
 >>
 >>
 >><http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960A>
 >>\$1,150.00 \$649.95
 >>Angled-front version.
 >>Black grille cloth
 >>White piping
 >>Black elephant grain vinyl
 >>Speaker: 4 x 12 in. G12T-75
 >>Power: 300 watt
 >>Impedance: 4 or 16 ohms mono/8 ohms stereo
 >>Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360mm
 >>Weight: 36.4 kg
 >>
 >>
 >><http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AX>
 >>\$1,500.00 \$1,049.00
 >>Angled front
 >>Vintage-circa early 70's
 >>Checkered cloth
 >>White piping
 >>Medium size white logo
 >>Black Levant vinyl
 >>Gold beading on Cab
 >>Speakers: 4 Celestion G12 M-25w SPKR-00016
 >>Power: 100 watts
 >>Impedance: 16 ohm
 >>Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360 mm
 >>Weight: 37.7 kg
 >>Cover: COVR-00022 optional
 >>
 >>
 >><http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AHW>
 >>\$1,800.00 \$1,200.00
 >>Loaded with Celestion G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
 >>To complement the 1959HW's visual and sonic majesty, Marshall =
 offers the
 >
 >>1960AHW (angled) 4x12 cabinet. It boasts basket weave fret =
 cloth, metal

>
>>handles, "100" logos, and is loaded with Celestion's =
highly-acclaimed
>>G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
>>
>>
>>
>=20

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?

<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

-----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C6D86A.486E9EE0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

<HTML><HEAD>

<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html"; =

charset=3Diso-8859-1">

<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>

<STYLE></STYLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV>Yes</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<BLOCKQUOTE dir=3Dltr=20

style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =

BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">

<DIV>"Aaron Allen" <<A=20

=

href=3D"mailto:know-spam@not_here.dude">know-spam@not_here.dude> =

wrote in=20

message <A =

href=3D"news:450a3e45@linux">news:450a3e45@linux...</DIV>

<DIV>Same rig.. you mean my pre and amp=20

setup?</DIV>

<BLOCKQUOTE dir=3Dltr=20

style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =

BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">

<DIV>"Tom Bruhl" <<A=20

href=3D"mailto:arpeggio@comcast.net">arpeggio@comcast.net> =

wrote in=20

message <A =

href=3D"news:450a3d8f@linux">news:450a3d8f@linux...</DIV>

<DIV>Aaron,</DIV>
<DIV>Matching amp/cabs are a no brainer =
but not=20
always exactly right.</DIV>
<DIV>But the right speakers can sound =
like ass in a=20
bad cab too.</DIV>
<DIV>These days we are required to get =
all the=20
guitar sounds on every</DIV>
<DIV>CD when in a cover situation. =
It's harder=20
than a one sound only band.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>In general the smaller cabs have a =
harder time=20
with the low end</DIV>
<DIV>unless they're open back but then =
it's a little=20
uncontrolled</DIV>
<DIV>due to rear reflections, wall and =
stage=20
resonance. If you end up =
</DIV>
<DIV>having to over eq to <FONT =
face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>get it, it won't sound <FONT face=3DArial =
size=3D2>natural. =20
I love to see my </DIV>
<DIV>pants get <FONT face=3DArial =
size=3D2>wind=20
torn from the low end as long as =
it's=20
tight.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>My buddy used to have that same rig =
if I'm not=20
mistaken.</DIV>
<DIV>He used Thiele cabs with it. =
It sounded=20
really good. </DIV>
<DIV>not sure it sounded as good as it =
could with=20
the Thiele </DIV>
<DIV>cabs though. Nice to spread =
them out for=20
stereo!</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Good luck with your =
search,</DIV>
<DIV>Tom</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2> </DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>"Aaron Allen" <<A=20
=
href=3D"mailto:know-spam@not_here.dude">know-spam@not_here.dude> =
wrote=20
in message <A =
href=3D"news:450a3340@linux">news:450a3340@linux...</DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE=20
style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">Good=20
info.... I like the idea of the smaller cab, and the lower wattage =

speaks, but I'm a little spooked at the total lack of specs =
locatable=20
on the
net about these guys... I don't want a cab that can't =
get=20
anything under say
90hz... that'd suck.

Hemp cone, =
eh?
I=20
wonder if they'll just lay around eating Cheetos, watching TV and =
react=20

sluggishly when I ask them to help around the house or get a =
job=20
:)

We agree on the alnico/ceramic debate. Like Alnico in a =
pickup..=20
not so much
in a speaker.

AA

"DC" <<A=20
href=3D"mailto:dc@spammersatGC.com">dc@spammersatGC.com> =
wrote in=20
message <A=20
=
href=3D"news:450a2ec6\$1@linux">news:450a2ec6\$1@linux...
>
&g=
t;=20
I think the cheaper cabinet will most likely involve the =
chinese
>=20
made celestions which I have not heard good things =
about.
>
>=20
You really need to hear a cabinet with your amp. There =
are
>=20
big differences to be found.
>
>
> At last =
year's NAMM,=20
I was really knocked out by the
> Tone Tubby hempcone=20
speakers.
>
> They have 4x12's.
>
> <A=20

Marshall/Celestion custom-designed speakers (30W=20
& each) Dimensions (W x H x D): 26.4 x 26.4 x =
0=20
=

Page 11 of 416 ---- Generated from The PARIS Forums

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled

Posted by [DC](#) on Thu, 10 Aug 2006 21:07:57 GMT

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

[illegible]

\$1,200.00
>Loaded with Celestion G12H-30 re-issue=20

speakers.
>>To complement the 1959HW's visual and sonic =

majesty,=20

Marshall offers the
>>>1960AHW (angled) 4x12 = cabinet. It=20

boasts basket weave fret cloth, metal
>>handles, =
"100"=20

logos, and is loaded with Celestion's =

highly-acclaimed>>G12H-30=20

re-issue speakers.
>
>
>
>=20

</BLOCKQUOTE>

<DIV>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight =
spam, and=20

you?
<A=20

==

href=3D"http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html">http://www.polesoft.com/refer=

```
..html</A>&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></DIV></BLOCKQUOTE ></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY>=</HTML>
```

-----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C6D86A.486E9EE0--This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

```
-----= NextPart 000 000B 01C6D86B.6192F8C0
```

Content-Type: text/plain;

```
charset="iso-8859-1"
```

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Aaron,

I just emailed my friend to see if it's exactly what he used.

I also asked what would give you the tone you desire.

Clear clean, brown dist and good bottom. He is a guitar

tone fanatic. His suggestions may also be something to look=20

into.=20

I may have some older recorded stuff of his around here. I'll look for = it.

I have a huge weekend of work so it may be a few days if at all.

Tom

"Tom B

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled

Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Thu, 10 Aug 2006 23:26:31 GMT

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

ruhl" <arpegio@comcast.net> wrote in message =
news:450a3f07@linux...

Yes

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message =
news:450a3e45@linux...

Same rig.. you mean my pre and amp setup?

"Tom Bruhl" <arpegio@comcast.net> wrote in message =
news:450a3d8f@linux...

Aaron,

Matching amp/cabs are a no brainer but not always exactly right.

But the right speakers can sound like ass in a bad cab too.

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled

Posted by [DC](#) on Thu, 10 Aug 2006 23:27:55 GMT

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

These days we are required to get all the guitar sounds on every
CD when in a cover situation. It's harder than a one sound only =
band.

In general the smaller cabs have a harder time with the low end
unless they're open back but then it's a little uncontrolled
due to rear reflections, wall and stage resonance. If you end up=20
having to over eq to get it, it won't sound natural. I love to =
see my=20
pants get wind torn from the low end as long as it's tight.

My buddy used to have that same rig if I'm not mistaken.
He used Thiele cabs with it. It sounded really good. I'm=20
not sure it sounded as good as it could with the Thiele=20
cabs though. Nice to spread them out for stereo!

Good luck with your search,
Tom

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message =
news:450a3340@linux...

Good info.... I like the idea of the smaller cab, and the lower =
wattage=20

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 11 Aug 2006 09:38:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 05:48:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Page 14 of 416 ---- Generated from The PARIS Forums

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 05:59:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by Sarah on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 11:11:56 GMT

>>news:450c23c7\$1@linux...
>>> Neil,
>>>
>>> I've got a matched pair of SE3's on loan here from Morgan. If you would
>>> like, I'll send them down to El Paso and let you give them a test drive.
>>I'm
>>> not tracking anything for a couple of weeks and can spare these, though
> I
>>> will feel naked and vulnerable without them. These are getting the nod
>>over
>>> my AKG C460B's and my KM 184's on a regular basis for micing guitars.
> I've
>>> got a pair of Rode NT5's here and we're not even talking same ballpark.
>>>
>>> Deej
>>>
>>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@IOU.com> wrote in message news:450c1c74\$1@linux...
>>> >
>>> > What's your current fave for Cardioid

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 18:09:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> > "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>> > news:450b60d5@linux...
>> > > yup
>> > >
>> > > "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>> > > news:450b5d6b@linux...
>> > >> Ummm, I'm sorta freaked out and wanting precision right now. You
>mean,
>> > >> "That's the ticket", right?
>> > >>
>> > >>
>> > >> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>> > >> news:450b5c7c@linux...
>> > >>> That's your daisy.
>> > >>> AA
>> > >>>
>> > >>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>> > >>> news:450b584d@linux...
>> > >>>> The only thing I can see for this is to "clear the Real Time Clock
>> RAM
>> > >>>> in CMOS". This would "clear the CMOS memory of date, time, and
>system
>> > >>>> setup parameters by erasing the CMOS RTC RAM data".

```

>> > >>>>
>> > >>>> This involves removing the onboard battery and moving jumper cap
>from
>> > >>>> pins 1-2 to pins 2-3., then back to pins 1-2, then reinstalling
the
>> > >>>> battery. It says you have to enter the BIOS and re-enter data.
>> > >>>>
>> > >>>> Is this the thing to do?
>> > >>>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
>> > >>>> news:450b4d10@linux...
>> > >>>>> All you need do is reset the BIOS by shorting out the relevant
>> jumper
>> > >>>>> on the motherboard...it's in the manual.
>> > >>>>> --
>> > >>>>> Martin Harrington
>> > >>>>> www.lendaneer-sound.com
>> > >>>>>
>> > >>>>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>> > >>>>> news:450b4198@linux...
>> > >>>>>> I disabled all but the com1 and lpt 1. Can't find them.
>> > >>>>>>
>> > >>>>>> Bad news is, and this is really bad news, computer won't boot
up.
>> On
>> > >>>>>> that black page that now doesn't flash by so fast at all, I
get
>> the
>> > >>>>>> error message "USB device over current status detected". Then
the
>> > >>>>>> computer shuts down. Won't boot up, won't let me go to BIOS to
>fix
>> > >>>>>> it.
>> > >>>>>>
>> > >>>>>> Heeeeeelp!
>> > >>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>
>> > >>>>>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450b3aac$1@linux...
>> > >>>>>>> It looks like another messed up Asus manual. I downloaded
the
>> > >>>>>>> manual and on page 2-18 it has that pic. I would turn off Com1
>> > >>>>>>> (irq4), floppy (irq 6), lpt1 (irq 7), Serial port, turn off
>> onboard
>> > >>>>>>> audio and USB, Keep the LAN on so you can network but I would
>try
>> > >>>>>>> only slots 3 and 4 only first. Notice how they don't even show
>> audio
>> > >>>>>>> sharing with anything. This diagram is craptastic.
>> > >>>>>>>

```

>> > >>>>>> And turn off Hyper Threading.
>> > >>>>>>
>> > >>>>>> Do ME and favor and call them on the phone and ask then what
the
>> > >>>>>> hell is this diagram means. Simply, what slots share with
>what?
>> > >>>>>> Inquiring minds !
>> > >>>>>>
>> > >>>>>> John
>> > >>>>>>
>> > >>>>>> Uptown Jimmy wrote:
>> > >>>>>> I guess I don't understand what the Alphabetized row indicates.
>> In
>> > >>>>>> other
>> > >>>>>> words, if PCI slot 1 "shared"

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 18:46:43 GMT

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

t;>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450af67f\$1@linux...
>> > >>>>>>> Use the second section that shows what are shared. Then make
>> sure
>> > >>>>>>> your
>> > >>>>>>> EDS
>> > >>>>>>> cards are NOT on them. For example, turn off onboard audio
>in
>> > >>>>>>> bios and
>> > >>>>>>> now you can use the slot that shares with onboard audio.
Any
>> > >>>>>>> device that
>> > >>>>>>> you are using like AGP video you DO NOT want an EDS card to
be
>> on
>> > >>>>>>> a shared
>> > >>>>>>> slot.
>> > >>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>> On boot up check to make sure that the black screen that
>flashes
>> > >>>>>>> by shows
>> > >>>>>>> this correctly.
>> > >>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>> > >>>>>>> Okay, on the IRQ page in the manual, it has two sections:
>> > >>>>>>>

>> > >>>>>>>> 1. "Standard interrupt assignments", which list IRQ numbers
>and
>> > >>>>>>>> their
>> > >>>>>>>> "standard function". (This section does list 7 "IRQs are
>> usually
>> > >>>>>>>> available
>> > >>>>>>>> for PCI devices")
>> > >>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>> 2. "IRQ" assignments for this motherboard", which graphs
>> various
>> > >>>>>>>> PCI
>> > >>>>>>>> slots
>> > >>>>>>>> or USB controllers as "nil", "shared", or "used" against
>> letters
>> > >>>>>>>> of the
>> > >>>>>>>> alphabet.
>> > >>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>> I don't know how to use these two sets of data to resolve
my
>> > >>>>>>>> problem.
>> > >>>>>>>> They
>> > >>>>>>>> seem incompatible. I feel ignernt.
>> > >>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> > >>>>>>>> news:450a0f48@linux...
>> > >>>>>>>> Hmmm.....wellletsee.....ASUS boards normally
>will
>> > >>>>>>>> have the
>> > >>>>>>>> AGP
>> > >>>>>>>> sharing an IRQ with two PCI slots, basically making these
>> > >>>>>>>> worthless for
>> > >>>>>>>> anything else.
>> > >>>>>>>> How many PCI slots does your mobo have?
>> > >>>>>>>> If it's a 5 slot board and it's similar to an AMD board,
>> chances
>> > >>>>>>>> are
>> > >>>>>>>> that
>> > >>>>>>>> PCI slots 1 and 5 are shared with the AGP and the firewire
>> port
>> > >>>>>>>> (thus
>> > >>>>>>>> making
>> > >>>>>>>> FW audio interfaces iffy also if using the onboard FW)
>> > >>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>> PCI slot 2 may share with your LAN controller
>> > >>>>>>>> PCI #3 may share with onboard RAID and SATA controller
>> > >>>>>>>> PCI 4 may not share with anything.
>> > >>>>>>>>

```
>> > >>>>>>>>>> This is the way the ASUS A8V mobo is configured but it's
for
>> AMD
>> > >>>>>>>>>> CPU's.
>> > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>> Do you have the manual? All of this is listed in chapter
2
>> under
>> > >>>>>>>>>> the
>> > >>>>>>>>>> heading
>> > >>>>>>>>>> Interrupt Assignments. It should be noted for Intel mobo's
>as
>> > >>>>>>>>>> well.
>> > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>> If it's 6, try putting the EDS card in PCI 2, 3, 4 or 5
>> > >>>>>>>>>> If it's 5, try PCI slot 1,
>> > >>>>>>>>>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>> > >>>>>>>>>> news:4509fd03@linux...
>> > >>>>>>>>>> It's an Asus P5P800 SE board with a Pentium 4 HT chip.
>> > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> > >>>>>>>>>> news:4509f8fc@linux.
```

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 20:36:11 GMT

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

```
gt;>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> IRQ!! IRQ!! IRQ!!
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> This sounds exactly like the EDS card is sharing and
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> interrupt
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> with
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> AGP
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> slot.
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in
>message
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> news:45098f86$1@linux...
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Hi-ho.
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I am still having trouble with my Paris rig. In an
```


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

>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Anybody?

>> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Jimmy

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

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

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

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

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

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

>> > >>>>>>>>

>> > >>>>>>

>> > >>>>>

>> > >>>>>

>> > >>>>

>> > >>>>

>> > >>>

>> > >>>

>> > >>

>> > >>

>> > >

>> > >

>>>

>>>

>>

>>

 $\succ$

>I recall a similar irony, if that's the right word, during the Danish cartoon flap: Muslim fanatics using violence to protest the implication that Islam is a violent religion. Is it possible they didn't realize they were proving the validity of the cartoons? Hard to believe.

Unfortunately, Osama bin Laden and others have much of the Muslim world convinced that the US is engaged in a war on Islam. Even more unfortunately, I think for some this actually is an unspoken motive in our "war on terror."

To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.

Sigh,

Sarah

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...

>I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found
>this ironic, at best:

 $\succ$

> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
> year
> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
> and
> inhuman" because of its command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it isn't
> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>
> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the West
> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
> fluid -
> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>
> Umm...reality check: $2+2=4$. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
> doesn't
> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then some?
> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>
> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
> response, not a crime.
>
> Why are we

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 21:04:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

rted. :)

S

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
news:450c9fbe\$1@linux...

> Seems to me that it's time to bring back King Arthur.....

> --

> Martin Harrington

> www.lendaneer-sound.com

>

> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message

> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...

>>I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found

>> this ironic, at best:

>>
>> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
>> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
>> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
>> year
>> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
>> and
>> inhuman" because of its command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
>> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
>> isn't
>> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>>
>> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
>> West
>> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
>> fluid -
>> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>>
>> Umm...reality check: $2+2=4$. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
>> doesn't
>> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
>> some?
>> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
>> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>>
>> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
>> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
>> response, not a crime.
>>
>> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
>> to
>> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
>> rewriting
>> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>>
>> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
>> a
>> cliff.
>>
>> Back to music...
>> Dedic
>>
>
>.....wait!!!!it's Clinton's fault!!!!.....no!!!!.....it's Eisenhower's
>fault!!!!!!.....hell, maybe it's Muhammad's fault!!!!.....not, it's Jesus'
>fault!!!!.....

"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message
news:450c9a65@linux...
> Agreed to both.
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> news:450c8c11@linux...
> > It's Bush's fault.
> >
> > "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> > news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> >> I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just
> >> found
> >> this ironic, at best:
> >>
> >> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> >> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> >> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
> > year
> >> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
> > and
> >> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith".
The
> >> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
> >> isn't
> >> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
> >>
> >> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
> >> West
> >> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
> > fluid -
> >> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
> >>
> >> Umm...reality check: $2+2=4$. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
> > doesn't
> >> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
> >> some?
> >> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of
this
> >> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
> >>
> >> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence
was
> >> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was
a
> >> response, not a crime.
> >>
> >> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so

hard
> > to
> >> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
> > rewriting
> >> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think
about....
> >>
> >> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off
of
> > a
> >> cliff.
> >>
> >> Back to music...
> >> Dedric
> >>
> >
> >
>
>"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:

>To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.

Imagine there's no hippies... It's easy if you try...

Sorry, couldn't resist.

DCApparently it's an abomination to Islam to discuss whether or not Mohammed said anything other than what a few *chosen* mullas decide is OK. I still find it disturbingly amazing that those on the left in this country are so friggin blind that they don't see what is in store for them if they win the ideological struggle that is going on in this country and in doing so, further empower the very antithesis of everything they believe in.

Take a good look at what is happening. It is not Bush's fault. It started long before Bush took office. It is the natural progression of the radical Islamic agenda to use *any* excuse to jump up and down like a bunch of automations, shoot guns in the air and burn things whilst blithering a bunch of racist, hate driven nonsense.

Coming soon to a *Sudetenland* near you.

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:450ca327@linux...
> I recall a similar irony, if that's the right word, during the Danish
> cartoon flap: Muslim fanatics using violence to protest the implication
> that Islam is a violent religion. Is it possible they didn't realize they

> were proving the validity of the cartoons? Hard to believe.
>
> Unfortunately, Osama bin Laden and others have much of the Muslim world
> convinced that the US is engaged in a war on Islam. Even more
> unfortunately, I think for some this actually is an unspoken motive in our
> "war on terror."
>
> To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.
>
> Sigh,
>
> Sarah
>
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> >I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just
found
> > this ironic, at best:
> >
> > The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> > Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> > motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
> > year
> > old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
> > and
> > inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith".
The
> > Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
isn't
> > even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
> >
> > As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
West
> > Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
> > fluid -
> > charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
> >
> > Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
> > doesn't
> > reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
some?
> > Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of
this
> > response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
> >
> > The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
> > actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was

a

> > response, not a crime.

> >

> > Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard

> > to

> > avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means

> > rewriting

> > the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....

> >

> > Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of

> > a

> > cliff.

> >

> > Back to music...

> > Dedric

> >

>

>I just got a pair of these. I like them a lot.

http://www.shure.com/ProAudio/Products/WiredMicrophones/us_p ro_KSM137-SL_content

DCDoes the US have anyone that really excels in diplomacy? Henry Kissinger always seemed to be amazing to me and I'm wondering who now days does effective diplomacy.

Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are beyond diplomacy? I always look for diplomatic solutions but I think the US government has totally stopped any real diplomacy. Yes, No ? Didn't we wait a good week for Israel to blow up Pakestan last month until we Condi wandered over to the UN and said "hey, you think it's time to reduce the kill rate to show we care?".

JohnDo you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are beyond > diplomacy?

North Korea?.....why not ask the Clintons? Iran?.....no problem.....all we have to do is abandon Israel and convert to Islam.
Syria????.....I'd rather try to herd cats.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450cb4fb\$1@linux...

>

&

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 21:44:16 GMT

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

do you really
think it fair to discredit both his clearly stated motive and
the reasoning behind it in favor of anti-christian paranoia?

Lincoln lived during the 2nd awakening and often used "good vs.
evil" as a part of his reasoning as well. Would you be
frightened of him as well?

Can only atheists be president?

Where is the specific evidence for the motivations you assign
to Bush?

Can you not call the jihadis "evil"?

>Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?

Oh hell yeah Gene, can't you?

http://www.breitbart.com/news/na/cp_w091615A.xml.html

http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/worldnews.html?in_article_id=405238&in_page_id=1811&ico=Home page&icl=TabModule&icc=NEWS&ct=5

<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/763199.html>

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/printFriendly/0,,1-3-2360093-3,00.html>

<http://www.thereligionofpeace.com/index.html#Attacks>

And all you can do is hate Bush for being Christian...

What is your plan to protect us?

DCWhy was Kissinger successful? He had an agenda.....get us out of VietNam.
Everyone agreed on this agenda....even the Russians and therefore they were
willing to go the "detente" route. North Vietnam couldn't really pay them
for the billions they were expending to prop up that regime. As far as we
were concerned, there was never any real desire to stay there once Kissinger
took center stage. Cronkite declared victory for the Viet Cong at the end of
Tet (December 1968) and everyone went along with this so Kissinger had to

figure out how to go about getting out and getting our prisoners out.

As far as China goes, it was in China's interest to open up relations with the west because their economy was tanking and they were scared as hell of the Soviets.

These were the times we were extremely active in supporting Latin American dictatorships and he was accused of being complicit in war crimes by a few leftist journalists like Christopher Hitchens.

The thing is that international politics isn't pretty. Kissinger may have gotten the Nobel Peace prize, but it was more the time in history than the person, IMO. I mean, Arafat and Annan have gotten the Nobel Peace prize which shows how bogus it really is these days.

Trying to be the passive good guy and pleasing the world gets us the disastrous results of the Carter and Clinton administrations. Just a little correct intelligence at the right time and we'd likely not be in such a mess today. Too bad Clinton screwed the pooch on that one. When Kissinger was Secretary of State, we had an intelligence service that could be depended on. You can't conduct diplomacy without having a few hole cards.

DJ

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450cbe96\$1@linux...

>

> Ok, so diplomacy isn't working. But WHO are the diplomats and do they have

> any skill like Kissinger?

>

> John

>

> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

> >Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are beyond

> >> diplomacy?

> >

> >North Korea?.....why not ask the Clintons? Iran?.....no problem.....all

> >we have to do is abandon Israel and convert to Islam.

> >Syria????.....I'd rather try to herd cats.

> >

> >

> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450cb4fb\$1@linux...

> >>

> >> Does the US have anyone that really excels in diplomacy? Henry Kissinger

> >> always seemed to be amazing to me and I'm wondering who now days does
> >effective
> >> diplomacy.
> >>
> >> Do you believe that countries like Iran, Syria and North Korea are
beyond
> >> diplomacy? I always look for diplomatic solutions but I think the US
> >government
> >> has totally stopped any real diplomacy. Yes, No ? Didn't we wait a
> good
> >> week for Israel to blow up Pakestan last month until we Condi wandered
> >over
> >> to the UN and said "hey, you think it's time to reduce the kill rate to
> >show
> >> we care?".
> >>
> >> John
> >
> >
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>
>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>
>>the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>
>>Religion.
>
>
>Gene, that's absurd. You just passed the 5-year anniversary
>of the worst attack on americans in history, and you can't even
>grant the president the motive of protecting the rest of us?
>
>

as do I (at least for the moment). This is not just about religious fervor,
oars In the water. If I am right, this is the most dangerous period in our
history.

But to my point, this is also from the Washington Post:

Another Rapture writer says he advises White House

by Dan Froomkin, Washington Post

Aug. 4, 2006

Joel C. Rosenberg, who writes Christian apocalyptic fiction, told me in an interview this week that he was invited to a White House Bible study group last year to talk about current events and biblical prophecy.

Rosenberg said that on February 10, 2005, he came to speak to a "couple dozen" touch with several of them since.

Rosenberg wouldn't say exactly what was discussed. "The meeting itself was off the record, as you could imagine," he said. He declined to name the staffer he said invited him or describe the attendees in any way other than to say that the president was not among them. "I can't imagine they'd want to talk about it," he said.

"I can't tell you that the people that I spoke with agree with me, or believe
t

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 21:53:18 GMT

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

gued that these things keep on happening Your novels keep foreshadowing actual coming events. ... And so we're curious, how are you doing it? What's the secret? Why don't you come over and walk us through the story behind these novels?' So I did."

about the apocalypse. The consistent theme is that certain current events presage the end times, the Rapture, and the return of Jesus Christ. Rosenberg's particular pitch to journalists is that his books come true.

Here he is in a recent interview with Christian talk-show host Pat Robertson , talking about what he thinks is going to happen next: "Now I have to say,

says He's going to supernaturally judge Iran, Sudan, Lebanon, Syria, these other countries. We're talking about fire from heaven, a massive earthquake. It's going to be devastating and tragic. But I believe that afterwards there's going to be a great spiritual awakening. We're seeing more Muslims coming to Christ right now than at any other time in history. But I think that's just the beginning. We've got dark days ahead of us. But I believe there's a light at the end of that tunnel."

Rosenberg says he got a call last year from a White House staffer. "He said 'A lot of people over here are reading your novels, and they're intrigued that these things keep on happening Your novels keep foreshadowing

actual coming events. ... And so we're curious, how are you doing it? What's the secret? Why don't you come over and walk us through the story behind these novels?' So I did."

Judy Keen first wrote back in October 2002, in USA Today, that "some White House staffers have been meeting weekly at hour-long prayer and Bible study sessions."Gene,

If I actually believed this, I might agree with you. We've certainly disagreed on a number of issues like this but I respect your opinion. I'm sincerely interested to know if this is for real. I've got no problem with people practicing their faith but I do believe that faith in something (like armageddon) can definitely bring it about. I've read a number of articles discussing these things you bring up here, but the sources were easily as fanatical as they purported Bush to be.

I agree that we may be living in the most dangerous time in the history of the human race, but I don't see the same villain that you do.

Deej

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message news:450cdc49\$1@linux...

>

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

> >

> >"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

> >

> >>the president has had an even scarier motivation.

> >>

> >>Religion.

> >

> >

> >Gene, that's absurd. You just passed the 5-year anniversary
> >of the worst attack on Americans in history, and you can't even
> >grant the president the motive of protecting the rest of us?

> >

> >

>

> I'm not going to argue this with you. You still have a right to your opinion,

> as do I (at least for the moment). This is not just about religious fervor,

> I honestly think the Pres is not 100% with it. I don't think he has all his

> oars in the water. If I am right, this is the most dangerous period in our
> history.

>
>
> But to my point, this is also from the Washington Post:
>
> Another Rapture writer says he advises White House
>
> by Dan Froomkin, Washington Post
>
> Aug. 4, 2006
>
> Joel C. Rosenberg, who writes Christian apocalyptic fiction, told me in an
> interview this week that he was invited to a White House Bible study group
> last year to talk about current events and biblical prophecy.
>
> Rosenberg said that on February 10, 2005, he came to speak to a "couple
dozen"
> White House aides in the Old Executive Office Building - and has stayed in
> touch with several of them since.
>
> Rosenberg wouldn't say exactly what was discussed. "The meeting itself was
> off the record, as you could imagine," he said. He declined to name the
staffer
> he said invited him or describe the attendees in any way other than to say
> that the president was not among them. "I can't imagine they'd want to
talk
> about it," he said.
>
> "I can't tell you that the people that I spoke with agree with me, or
believe
> that prophecy can really help you understand what will happen next in the
> Middle East, but I'm not surprised that they're intrigued."
>
> The White House press office wasn't able to confirm the visit for me, but
> there have been previous reports about White House Bible study groups
inviting
> Christian authors to come speak.
>
>
> Apocalyptic advice:
> Aug. 12, 2003:
> Apocalypse preacher says Bush administration solicits his advice
>
> Aug. 17, 2003:
> Rice briefs 'Christian Zionists'
> on Mideast peace plan
>
> May 18, 2004:
> White House checked with rapture Christians before latest Israel move

>

> Aug. 8, 2006:

> Cheering for apocalypse, evangelical lunatics counsel Bush White House

>

> Rapture radicals

> Bush and the fundamentalists

> Rosenberg says he got a call last year from a White House staffer.

>

> "He said 'A lot of people over here are reading your novels, and they're

> intrigued that these things keep on happening Your novels keep

foreshadowing

> actual coming events. ... And so we're curious, how are you doing it?

What's

> the secret? Why don't you come over and walk us through the story behind

> these novels?' So I did."

> Rosenberg - like Tim LaHaye and Jerry B. Jenkins, the authors of the

phenomenally

> popular Left Behind series - writes fiction inspired by biblical prophecy

> about the apocalypse. The consistent theme is that certain current events

> presage the end times, the Rapture, and the return of Jesus Christ.

Rosenberg's

> particular pitch to journalists is that his books come true.

>

> Here he is in a recent interview with Christian talk-show host Pat

Robertson

> , talking about what he thinks is going to happen next: "Now I have to

say,

> Pat, I believe that Ezekiel 38 and 39 - the prophecies that we're talking

> about - I think this is about the end of radical Islam as we know it. God

> says He's going to supernaturally judge Iran, Sudan, Lebanon, Syria, these

> other countries. We're talking about fire from heaven, a massive

earthquake.

> It's going to be devastating and tragic. But I believe that afterwards

there's

> going to be a great spiritual awakening. We're seeing more Muslims coming

> to Christ right now than at any other time in history. But I think that's

> just the beginning. We've got dark days ahead of us. But I believe there's

> a light at the end of that tunnel."

>

> Rosenberg says he got a call last year from a White House staffer. "He

said

> 'A lot of people over here are reading your novels, and they're intrigued

> that these things keep on happening Your novels keep foreshadowing

> actual coming events. ... And so we're curious, how are you doing it?

What's

> the secret? Why don't you come over and walk us through the story behind

> these novels?' So I did."

>

> Judy Keen first wrote back in October 2002, in USA Today, that "some White
> House staffers have been meeting weekly at hour-long prayer and Bible
study
> sessions."
>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>Gene,
>
>If I actually believed this, I might agree with you. We've certainly
>disagreed on a number of issues like this but I respect your opinion. I'm
>sincerely interested to know if this is for real. I've got no problem with
>people practicing th

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 21:55:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

eir faith but I do believe that faith in something (like
>armageddon) can definitely bring it about. I've read a number of articles
>discussing thes things you bring up here, but the sources were easily as
>fanatical as they purported Bush to be.
>
>I agree that we may be living in the most dangerous time in the history
of
>the human race, but I don't see the same villian that you do.
>
>Deej
>

There is not just one villain, there are plenty of villains. Saddam Hussein,

As a US citizen, I feel like I have been put on the list by the unconscionable
actions of our government.

if not hundreds of thousands of innocent people in the name of bringing them
and put them to death without ever showing any evidence, why not.

Well I do have a problem. It is NOT OK.

I want my country back.

It was never perfect. No country ever was, but we stood for something great,

even if we sometimes had less than stellar moments. I know in my heart that if the Founding Fathers of the United States were alive today they would be calling for impeachment or revolution.

presidents that were deeply religious, but if he thinks that all the wars and problems we are having in the world are actually a good thing because they have ignited a resurgence in Christian Values, we are in deep shit.
GeneGene -

You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote a Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.

Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of the conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here. People die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own country in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to do.

The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence any sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24 hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad, and frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also includes believing in nothing.

As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as a sense of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be

considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies disbelief in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?

It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam doesn't like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public view. The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw it. Yet another paradox.

Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins and the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the balance that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.

I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.

I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of work :-((....

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>
>
> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
> administration
> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
> perusing
> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>
> Religion.

>
> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great Awakening"
> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against terrorists

> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble (as
> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>
> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>
> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go down
> hill from here.
>
> More on the "Third Awakening":
> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR200609120159](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)
> [4_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)
>
> Gene
> "gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>
>
> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current administration
> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for perusing
> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.

>
> Religion.

I think Bush believes in religious freedom, I don't think the jihadist feel
the same way.

>

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 22:06:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

erize it? Again this just
isn't a fair representation.

Never happened. In fact, the eavesdropping of international calls, made by likely terrorists, which was completely legal to do, and provided valuable information, was revealed by the NY Times, in an act of treason (to many of us). No one is opening your mail.

>have trials and find people guilty
>and put them to death without ever showing any evidence, why not.

Where did this happen? First, the Geneva Conventions *explicitly* exclude spies and saboteurs from protection, and governments regularly have executed them without being charged under the GC's, so how do you figure that jihadi are covered?

Do you think you and your loved ones are at risk from these people? If you don't, why not?

>Well I do have a problem. It is NOT OK.
>
>I want my country back.

Yeah, and I want to go see Bird and Diz on 52nd st. and meet a hot dame there.

Your country is a pre-9/11 one and I do not argue with you because I like arguing, nor do I wish to offend you, since I actually quite like you. But I am convinced that your views would result in my family being put in terrible danger. I cannot remain silent.

We will face jihadis, and we would if Ghandi himself were president. They have revealed themselves to us, for the past 30 years, to be the scum they are. To believe that they can be negotiated with, has to be beyond the pale today.

I wish it were otherwise.

>It was never perfect. No country ever was, but we stood for something great,
>even if we sometimes had less than stellar moments. I know in my heart that
>if the Founding Fathers of the United States were alive today they would
>be calling for impeachment or revolution.

This is an interesting point. They were very wary of "foreign entanglements" but they also went to North Africa and fought the Barbary Pirates so that the seas would be safe, so I am not sure you are right on this.

They would certainly barely recognize our country though. Liberal, big-govt. would have horrified them for certain; surely you realize this?

>presidents that were deeply religious, but if he thinks that all the wars
>and problems we are having in the world are actually a good thing because
>they have ignited a resurgence in Christian Values, we are in deep shit.

I agree, but where is the *evidence* that he makes his decisions based upon those things? He's such a cautious man in so many ways. Don't believe me? Remember the "moral equivilence" argument that idiots like Ward Churchill make? That we are all "little eichmanns" participating in this great evil?

OK, so assume for a moment that we are morally equivalent to Al Queda. Now, what would we have done the morning of 9/12/01?

Think about it! All those subs, all those missiles, all those nukes.

Green glass in Kabul, green glass in Baghdad, same in Tehran, same in Damascus. Then Bush gets on TV and says: "who's next"? That's moral equivalence my friend, and frankly it's what those bastards would do to us if they could.

Instead, Bush tries to foment democracy, and he believes in it so much that he pays to do it the slow and painful way when he could have punched the big red button, and converted the survivors at gunpoint.

As a Christian, I can tell you that the Bible *at no point* says that we are to start wars and kill people to bring about armageddon. There are idiots who believe such things, but those named in the article you quoted are not among them, and those beliefs are not widely held among us. Believing it to be soon, is very different from trying to make it happen.

DCDedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>People

>die for converting to anything else, or their families do.

There's a pretty well-known engineer out here in LA whose ex-muslim wife must forever watch her back because she is under the threat of "honor killing" (how's that for Orwellian double-speak?) for marrying a non-muslim and leaving the faith.

DC"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>Gene, maybe I am misunderstanding what you are saying, but it sounds like
>you are saying that Bush is starting and wants a religious war. I think
>you may be confused. Other people have already started the religious war.

> Look in to the sixth and seventh pillar of Islam, some where in there it
>speaks of living by the sword. In other words, if you don't convert, you
>are to die. I for one do not believe they are civil or peaceful people.
> There has not been peace among those people for thousands of years, and
>now THEY have sucked us in.

>

>They would be nothing in the middle east, but the Communists, Russia and
>China, supplied all these third world countries with tons of weapons! Now
>they can make bombs and wage war. Now they know how to make nuclear bombs
>that can take out US cities. Look at the middle east, south America, North
>Korea and the mess all across the continent of Africa. Evil people gave
>more evil people weapons to fight wars with. This has created a world problem,
>and the Communist want to keep supplying them with weapons and technology.
> I know, here comes the liberals with, we gave them weapons too. Think
about

>it, where did this start?

>

>I'm no fan of Bush, but it's just too easy, and unfair to say it's all Bush's
>fault.

>

> I will say however, the War in Iraq was completely mishandled. Just do
>the math, one hundred and fifty thousand troops to take care of thirty five
>million people plus, and thousands of miles of open boarder, in a place
>the size of California. With five million troops, maybe??? I believe Bush
>and his friends wanted to be there for years and make all kinds of money
>on this war. He has created a bigger problem by not taking care of Iraq
>quickly. There is a lot of blame to go around in our federal government,
>it's not just one man.

>

>As far as the war on terror, people should be honest with themselves. you
>can't negotiate a war. there is no diplomatic solution to a war. If you
>stop to talk, they reinforce, rebuild, and reorganize for more war. Or
did

>we forget the lessons of the past.
>
>In the end, bombs can never stop idealism. The problem is the people that
>want Jihad will not stop. Peace will never be lasting with these people,
>it's in their nature to be warring. They think they will be rewarded if
they
>kill and die in the name of Islam. So how do you fix it?
>
> We are more concerned with terrorist rights than doing the job we need
to
>do. When they hit us, we'll have to take them out, make no mistake, it's
>going to get serious. When they kill millions of americans, blame the spineless
>politicians that wanted to talk things out and find political solutions
instead
>of facing the hard truth, we are at WAR. We should take care of the problems
>now, but we are just too weak as a nation. Really think about why we are
>weak as a nation, and where the blame should go.
>
>James
>

James,

statement:

Please help me define what the problem is. Is it Muslims? Just some Muslims?
Which ones?

What about North Korea? They are not Muslims, but they are first (or perhaps
things. Pakistan is Muslim and they have several bombs. They have just signed
a treaty with the Taliban, and they are hiding the real person that caused
9/11, where is the outrage against Osama bin Laden and the people protecting
him?

How about the Non-Aligned Movement. Over 100 countries banding together
with Cuba or Venezuela?

Now that we have succeeded in alienating ourselves from the majority of the
world, should we see them all as threats? Almost all of our allies are abandoning
us, or at the least distancing themselves from us. The only real leader left
is on our side

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 22:08:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

/>
>If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great Awakening"
>of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
>it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against terrorists

>as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble (as
>has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>
>Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?

I don't think we are being give a choice, or did you forget 9/11?
>
>Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go down
>hill from here.
>
Things will go down hill if we do take care of these problems.

>More on the "Third Awakening":
> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html
>
>Gene
>

Gene, maybe I am misunderstanding what you are saying, but it sounds like you are saying that Bush is starting and wants a religious war. I think you may be confused. Other people have already started the religious war. Look in to the sixth and seventh pillar of Islam, some where in there it speaks of living by the sword. In other words, if you don't convert, you are to die. I for one do not believe they are civil or peaceful people. There has not been peace among those people for thousands of years, and now THEY have sucked us in.

They would be nothing in the middle east, but the Communists, Russia and China, supplied all these third world countries with tons of weapons! Now they can make bombs and wage war. Now they know how to make nuclear bombs that can take out US cities. Look at the middle east, south America, North Korea and the mess all across the continent of Africa. Evil people gave more evil people weapons to fight wars with. This has created a world problem, and the Communist want to keep supplying them with weapons and technology. I know, here comes the liberals with, we gave them weapons too. Think about it, where did this start?

I'm no fan of Bush, but it's just too easy, and unfair to say it's all Bush's fault.

I will say however, the War in Iraq was completely mishandled. Just do the math, one hundred and fifty thousand troops to take care of thirty five million people plus, and thousands of miles of open boarder, in a place the size of California. With five million troops, maybe??? I believe Bush and his friends wanted to be there for years and make all kinds of money on this war. He has created a bigger problem by not taking care of Iraq quickly. There is a lot of blame to go around in our federal government, it's not just one man.

As far as the war on terror, people should be honest with themselves. you can't negotiate a war. there is no diplomatic solution to a war. If you stop to talk, they reinforce, rebuild, and reorganize for more war. Or did we forget the lessons of the past.

In the end, bombs can never stop idealism. The problem is the people that want Jihad will not stop. Peace will never be lasting with these people, it's in their nature to be waring. They think they will be rewarded if they kill and die in the name of Islam. So how do you fix it?

We are more concerned with terrorist rights than doing the job we need to do. When they hit us, we'll have to take them out, make no mistake, it's going to get serious. When they kill millions of americans, blame the spineless politicians that wanted to talk things out and find political solutions instead of facing the hard truth, we are at WAR. We should take care of the problems now, but we are just too weak as a nation. Really think about why we are weak as a nation, and where the blame should go.

JamesGene, I too respect your opinion.

I do ask you to look at another viewpoint.

I do consider yours, despite disagreeing with it often.

>As a US citizen, I feel like I have been put on the list by the unconscionable
>actions of our government.
>

There is no torture, not by any sane definition of the word.

Human Rights Watch recently defined putting an terrorist in a cold room, and blasting them with Red Hot Chili Peppers as torture. Hilarious. Abu Ghraib? Hazing rituals compared to Saddam, and the perps went to jail!

>Start wars without cause,

Now you know a case can be made for that war, don't you? Don't agree? Fine, but don't assume it does not exist.

>OK, cause the deaths of tens of thousands

>if not hundreds of thousands of innocent people in the name of bringing them

>freedom, no problem.

We spend millions of dollars on accurate weapons so we can kill the fewest innocents of any war in history, to liberate 25 million people, and this is how you charact

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 22:50:21 GMT

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

is Tony Blair, and he has been summarily dismissed by his own party. With him out and anti-American sentiment running high in Great Britain, who do we have left?

I never said it was all Bushes fault. He just took a relatively unheard of small time international criminal/terrorist (Osama bin Laden) and turned him into an international movement to destroy the US.

At a level of 1.2 billion, Muslims represent about 22% of the world's population. They are the second largest religion in the world. Only Christianity is larger, with 33% of the world's inhabitants.

Islam is growing about 2.9% per year. This is faster than the total world population which increases about 2.3% annually. It is thus attracting a progressively larger percentage of the world's population.

Peace to all

GeneROTFL 8>)

--

Martin Harrington

www.lendaneer-sound.com

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message [news:450ca49a\\$1@linux...](#)

> You don't need King Arthur, silly . . . you have King George the Decider

> and Richard (Cheney) the Lyin' Hearted. :)

>

> S

>
>
> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message
> news:450c9fbe\$1@linux...
>> Seems to me that it's time to bring back King Arthur.....
>> --
>> Martin Harrington
>> www.lendaneer-sound.com
>>
>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just
>>> found
>>> this ironic, at best:
>>>
>>> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
>>> Byzantine emperor's ancie

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [DC](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 23:59:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nt writings in a talk rejecting religious
>>> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
>>> year
>>> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
>>> and
>>> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith".
>>> The
>>> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
>>> isn't
>>> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>>>
>>> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
>>> West
>>> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
>>> fluid -
>>> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>>>
>>> Umm...reality check: 2+2=4. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
>>> doesn't
>>> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
>>> some?
>>> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of
>>> this
>>> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>>>

>>> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
>>> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was
>>> a
>>> response, not a crime.
>>>
>>> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
>>> to
>>> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
>>> rewriting
>>> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think
>>> about....
>>>
>>> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off
>>> of a
>>> cliff.
>>>
>>> Back to music...
>>> Dedic
>>>
>>
>>
>
>I don't know if I'm a "leftie" (or a hippie for that matter), but I do know
I'm definitely not blind. And here's another thing I'm not -- I'm not an
idiot.

Not being an idiot enables me to reason beyond simplistic black-or-white
logic. In doing so, what I find "disturbingly amazing" is this oft repeated
nonsense that if I don't support Bush's Crusade, I support the terrorists.

NEWS FLASH: Scientists have concluded that there may be MORE than TWO
approaches to the problem of terrorism. This should come as a relief to
those who have believed that our only options are: 1. wage war on Islamic
countries, or 2. do nothing. Yes, folks, there may be other possibilities
in between those two extremes, as the recent thwarted terror plot in Britain
demonstrates.

"OK, smart-ass, what about Iran?" you may be asking about now. Yes, what
about Iran? Shall we leave Iraq in the toilet and try the same thing in
Iran and hope for a different result? Isn't that the definition of
insanity? OK, you say, what if Iran gets a nuke or two? Yeah, what if? Do
you think they're going to guarantee their own obliteration by lobbing nukes
into Israel? Or what? Isn't it possible that Iran notices that we haven't
even threatened to attack North Korea, the neglected "Axis of Evil" sibling?
Perhaps Iran is thinking, "If we have nukes, the US won't dare invade us."
That would be a logical conclusion on their part, don't you think? If Iran
is financing terror, we're going to need the help of our allies, if we have
any left, to deal with them. We're also going to need leaders a lot smarter

and more honest than the one's we've got.

Here's a thought -- it occurs to me that in fighting the Nazis, Communism, and now Terrorism that our real consistent enemy in all these is brutal authoritarianism, AKA totalitarianism: we don't cotton to anyone trying to violently force their beliefs upon everyone else. Well, wake up and smell the despots, gang, because in our blind terror of Islamic extremists, we're allowing the very thing we fight against to creep into our own government. And this is proven every time someone is accused of "appeasing the terrorists" because they oppose the "war" in Iraq.

Look, once and for all -- NOBODY LIKES TERRORISTS, OK? Except other terrorists. But this doesn't mean we should continue to let insane people lead the charge against them.

Love,

Sarah

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:450ca327@linux...

>I recall a similar irony, if that's the right word, during the Danish
>cartoon flap: Muslim fanatics using violence to protest the implication
>that Islam is a violent religion. Is it possible they didn't realize they
>were proving the validity of the cartoons? Hard to believe.

>
> Unfortunately, Osama bin Laden and others have much of the Muslim world
> convinced that the US is engaged in a war on Islam. Even more
> unfortunately, I think for some this actually is an unspoken motive in our
> "war on terror."

>
> To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.

>
> Sigh,

>
> Sarah

>
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...

>>I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found
>> this ironic, at best:

>>
>> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
>> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
>> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
>> year
>> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil

>> and
>> inhuman" because if it's command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
>> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
>> isn't
>> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>>
>> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
>> West
>> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
>> fluid -
>> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>>
>> Umm...reality check: $2+2=4$. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
>> doesn't
>> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
>> some?
>> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
>> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>>
>> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
>> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
>> response, not a crime.
>>
>> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
>> to
>> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
>> rewriting
>> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>>
>> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
>> a
>> cliff.
>>
>> Back to music...
>> Dedic
>>
>
>Hi,
Just wanted to check: format Z:\64 sets cluster size to 32k, right? Which,
as it happened, was the default size formatting my 320Gb drives with Partition
Magic 8.01.
I've gone with FAT32 simply because I may need a Win98 install, either for
Paris (my XP install is buggy, though I suspect it's my dodgy AsusA7V880
motherboard) or for my Korg Oasys, which only runs under Win98. Seems that
for audio, there's little difference between NTFS and FAT32.
Danwhat folder

I'm on a PC using XP

DonAlso can I delete them and reinstall them without deleting and reinstalling Paris?

Don

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:450d2a0c@linux...

> what folder

>

> I'm on a PC using XP

>

> Don

>Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and obliterate dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with Kissinger's dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and knew clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.

There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.

So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone who clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't know anyone who seems to have the cool head that I percieve Kissinger had. Also, I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but he always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.

JohnI thought they were on www.parisfaqs.com but I don't see em. I have em on my server if you can't find em, let me know and I'll upload them to yousendit.com

There are three pieces to paris xp. Scherzo driver, Paris app and effects subsystem. You should be able to add remove programs for the subsystem and Paris. Everything only takes 5 mins so I would backup your "default project.ppj", paris.cfg and the "effects.var" (i forget it's real name). Remove all and reinstall in order...scherzo, paris, subsystem.

John

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>Also can I delete them and reinstall them without deleting and reinstalling

>Paris?

>

>Don

>

>

>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:450d2a0c@linux...

>> what folder
>>
>> I'm on a PC using XP
>>
>> Don
>>
>
>Yes 32k.....you're good to go !

"dan b" <daniel_burneNOSPAM@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>Hi,
>Just wanted to check: format Z:\64 sets cluster size to 32k, right? Which,
>as it happened, was the default size formatting my 320Gb drives with Partition
>Magic 8.01.
>I've gone with FAT32 simply because I may need a Win98 install, either for
>Paris (my XP install is buggy, though I suspect it's my dodgy AsusA7V880
>motherboard) or for my Korg Oasys, which only runs under Win98. Seems that
>for audio, there's little difference between NTFS and FAT32.
>DanSorry wrong question...I have the drivers...where are they located in my
computer and can they be deleted and reinstalled without uninstalling Paris

Don

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3c18\$1@linux...

>
> I thought they were on www.parisfaqs.com but I don't see em. I have em on
> my server if you can't find em, let me know and I'll upload them to
> yousendit.com
>
> There are three pieces to paris xp. Scherzo driver, Paris app and effects
> subsystem. You should be able to add remove programs for the subsystem
> and Paris. Everything only takes 5 mins so I would backup your "default
> project.ppj",
> paris.cfg and the "effects.var" (i forget it's real name). Remove all and
> reinstall in order...scherzo, paris, subsystem.
>
> John
>
>
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>Also can I delete them and reinstall them without deleting and
>>reinstalling
>
>>Paris?
>>
>>Don

>>
>>
>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:450d2a0c@linux...
>>> what folder
>>>
>>> I'm on a PC using XP
>>>
>>> Don
>>>
>>
>>
>I would like to check my 8 out cards before I finalise their sale and as
I've never had to use them the really friggin' dumb Q is

how do I get the audio on track 1 out of output 1 on the first card (S3) and
audio on track 9 out the output 1 on my second card (S4)

D> Almost all of our allies are abandoning >us, or at the least distancing
themselves from us.

This started long before 9-11. France, Russia , China and the UN were
working against us throughout the 90's. We just didn't have a clue because
we didn't have an intelligence service.

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message
news:450d0128\$1@linux...

>
> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> >Gene, maybe I am misunderstanding what you are saying, but it sounds like
> >you are saying that Bush is starting and wants a religious war. I think
> >you may be confused. Other people have already started the religious
> war.
> > Look in to the sixth and seventh pillar of Islam, some where in there it
> >speaks of living by the sword. In other words, if you don't convert, you
> >are to die. I for one do not believe they are civil or peaceful people.
> > There has not been peace among those people for thousands of years, and
> >now THEY have sucked us in.
> >
> >They would be nothing in the middle east, but the Communists, Russia and
> >China, supplied all these third world countries with tons of weapons!
Now
> >they can make bombs and wage war. Now they know how to make nuclear
bombs
> >that can take out US cities. Look at the middle east, south America,
North
> >Korea and the mess all across the continent of Africa. Evil people gave
> >more evil people weapons to fight wars with. This has created a world

problem,
 > >and the Communist want to keep supplying them with weapons and technology.
 > > I know, here comes the liberals with, we gave them weapons too. Think
 > about
 > >it, where did this start?
 > >
 > >I'm no fan of Bush, but it's just too easy, and unfair to say it's all Bush's
 > >fault.
 > >
 > > I will say however, the War in Iraq was completely mishandled. Just do
 > >the math, one hundred and fifty thousand troops to take care of thirty five
 > >million people plus, and thousands of miles of open boarder, in a place
 > >the size of California. With five million troops, maybe??? I believe Bush
 > >and his friends wanted to be there for years and make all kinds of money
 > >on this war. He has created a bigger problem by not taking care of Iraq
 > >quickly. There is a lot of blame to go around in our federal government,
 > >it's not just one man.
 > >
 > >As far as the war on terror, people should be honest with themselves. you
 > >can't negotiate a war. there is no diplomatic solution to a war. If you
 > >stop to talk, they reinforce, rebuild, and reorganize for more war. Or
 > did
 > >we forget the lessons of the past.
 > >
 > >In the end, bombs can never stop idealism. The problem is the people that
 > >want Jihad will not stop. Peace will never be lasting with these people,
 > >it's in their nature to be waring. They think they will be rewarded if
 > they
 > >kill and die in the name of Islam. So how do you fix it?
 > >
 > > We are more concerned with terrorist rights than doing the job we need
 > to
 > >do. When they hit us, we'll have to take them out, make no mistake, it's
 > >going to get serious. When they kill millions of americans, blame the spineless
 > >politicians that wanted to talk things out and find political solutions
 > instead
 > >of facing the hard truth, we are at WAR. We should take care of the problems
 > >now, but we are just too weak as a nation. Really think about why we are
 > >weak as a nation, and where the blame should go.
 > >

> >James
> >
>
>
> James,
> You have just as much right to your opinion as I do and I know we won't
change
> each other's minds one iota, but I still have to question you about this
> statement:
>
> "We should take care of the problems now, but we are just too weak as a
nation."
>
> Please help me define what the problem is. Is it Muslims? Just some
Muslims?
> Which ones?
>
> What about North Korea? They are not Muslims, but they are first (or
perhaps
> second) on the list of "most likely to do bad things" to us - Big bad bomb
> things. Pakistan is Muslim and they have several bombs. They have just
signed
> a treaty with the Taliban, and they are hiding the real person that caused
> 9/11, where is the outrage against Osama bin Laden and the people
protecting
> him?
>
> How about the Non-Aligned Movement. Over 100 countries banding together
> against US policies and interests? - Should we get them all? Should we
start
> with Cuba or Venezuela?
>
> Now that we have succeeded in alienating ourselves from the majority of
the
> world, should we see them all as threats? Almost all of our allies are
abandoning
> us, or at the least distancing themselves from us. The only real leader
left
> is on our side is Tony Blair, and he has been summarily dismissed by his
> own party. With him out and anti-American sentiment running high in Great
> Britain, who do we have left?
>
> I never said it was all Bushes fault. He just took a relatively unheard of
> small time international criminal/terrorist (Osama bin Laden) and turned
> him into an international movement to destroy the US.
> _____
>
> At a level of 1.2 billion, Muslims represent about 22% of the world's

population.

- > They are the second largest religion in the world. Only Christianity is larger,
- > with 33% of the world's inhabitants.
- > Islam is growing about 2.9% per year. This is faster than the total world
- > population which increases about 2.3% annually. It is thus attracting a progressively
- > larger percentage of the world's population.

>

> Peace to all

> Gene

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and
>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.

.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if your assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about now. We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we only kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it harder and harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't got the common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very disturbing to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...

>

> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and obliterate
> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with Kissinger's
> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and knew
> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.

>

> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and
> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.

>

> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone who
> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't know
> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I perceive Kissinger had.

Also,

> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but he
> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.

>
> John
>
>Send the analog output to an insert point in the Paris patchbay.

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:450d45bb@linux...

> I would like to check my 8 out cards before I finalise their sale and as
> I've never had to use them the really friggin' dumb Q is
>
> how do I get the audio on track 1 out of output 1 on the first card (S3)
and
> audio on track 9 out the output 1 on my second card (S4)
>
> D
>
>That's what I though...but don't you have to complete the circuit so to
speak

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450d48cc@linux...

> Send the analog output to an insert point in the Paris patchbay.
>
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:450d45bb@linux...
>> I would like to check my 8 out cards before I finalise their sale and as
>> I've never had to use them the really friggin' dumb Q is
>>
>> how do I get the audio on track 1 out of output 1 on the first card (S3)
> and
>> audio on track 9 out the output 1 on my second card (S4)
>>
>> D
>>
>>
>
>This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_002D_01C6DA41.98BFBDB0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Don,
Yes, Mec A channel 1 out to Insert channel 1 in and Insert channel 1 out
to Mec A channel 1 input. Same for channel 9. Make sure you drag =
'External'=20
into the Paris Mixer inserts for channels 1 and 9.
Tom

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:450d4acf@linux...
That's what I though...but don't you have to complete the circuit so =
to=20
speak

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message=20
news:450d48cc@linux...
> Send the analog output to an insert point in the Paris patchbay.
>
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:450d45bb@linux...
>> I would like to check my 8 out cards before I finalise their sale =
and as
>> I've never had to use them the really friggin' dumb Q is
>>
>> how do I get the audio on track 1 out of output 1 on the first card =
(S3)
> and
>> audio on track 9 out the output 1 on my second card (S4)
>>
>> D
>>
>>
>
>=20

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>
-----=_NextPart_000_002D_01C6DA41.98BFBDB0
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Don,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Yes, Mec A channel 1 out to Insert =
channel 1 in and=20
Insert channel 1 out</FONT></DIV>
```

<DIV>to Mec A channel 1 input. Same =
for channel=20
9. Make sure you drag 'External' </DIV>
<DIV>into the Paris Mixer <FONT =
face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>inserts for channels 1 and 9.</DIV>
<DIV>Tom</DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE=20
style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
 <DIV>"Don Nafe" <<A =
href=3D"mailto:dnafe@magma.ca">dnafe@magma.ca>=20
 wrote in message <A=20
 href=3D"news:450d4acf@linux">news:450d4acf@linux...</DIV>That's =
what I=20
 though...but don't you have to complete the circuit so to=20

speak

"DJ" <<A=20
 =
href=3D"mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net">animix_spam-this-ahole=
_@animas.net>=20
 wrote in message
<A=20
 href=3D"news:450d48cc@linux">news:450d48cc@linux...
> Send =
the analog=20
 output to an insert point in the Paris patchbay.
>
> "Don =
Nafe"=20
 <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in =
message <A=20
 href=3D"news:450d45bb@linux">news:450d45bb@linux...
>> I =
would like=20
 to check my 8 out cards before I finalise their sale and =
as
>> I've=20
 never had to use them the really friggin' dumb Q =
is
>>
>>=20
 how do I get the audio on track 1 out of output 1 on the first card=20
 (S3)
> and
>> audio on track 9 out the output 1 on my =
second=20
 card (S4)
>>
>> =
D
>>
>>
>
>=20

</BLOCKQUOTE>
<DIV>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, =
and=20
you?
<A=20
href=3D"http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html">http://www.polesoft.com/refer=
..html </DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_002D_01C6DA41.98BFBDB0--This just started happening.

I shut down Paris and get the first notice....clicking on "click here" gets

the second image and clicking on "click here" brings up an error report that is all gobbledee-gook to me - many modules listed the a whole wack of numbers and letters

Running on a PC with XP

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0128_01C6DA43.AC8BB9A0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

works like a charm...

so if I send Mec out 1 to insert 1 in and insert 1 out to Mec 9 in =
the audio should come down channel 9=20

thanks guys

"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote in message =

news:450d55aa@linux...

Don,

Yes, Mec A channel 1 out to Insert channel 1 in and Insert channel 1 =
out

to Mec A channel 1 input. Same for channel 9. Make sure you drag =
'External'=20

into the Paris Mixer inserts for channels 1 and 9.

Tom

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:450d4acf@linux...

That's what I though...but don't you have to complete the circuit so =
to=20
speak

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message=20

news:450d48cc@linux...

> Send the analog output to an insert point in the Paris patchbay.

>

> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message =
news:450d45bb@linux...

>> I would like to check my 8 out cards before I finalise their sale =
and as

>> I've never had to use them the really friggin' dumb Q is

>>

card (S3)

<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

Content-Type: text/html;

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<HTML><HEAD>

charset="iso-8859-1">

<STYLE></STYLE>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV> </DIV>

1=20

audio=20

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>"Tom Bruhl" <<A=20

message=20

<BLOCKQUOTE dir=3Dltr=20

BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">

<DIV>Yes, Mec A channel 1 out to Insert =
channel 1 in=20
and Insert channel 1 out</DIV>
<DIV>to Mec A channel 1 input. Same =
for channel=20
9. Make sure you drag 'External' </DIV>
<DIV>into the Paris Mixer <FONT =
face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>inserts for channels 1 and 9.</DIV>
<DIV>Tom</DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE=20
style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
<DIV>"Don Nafe" <<A =
href=3D"mailto:dnafe@magma.ca">dnafe@magma.ca>=20
wrote in message <A=20
href=3D"news:450d4acf@linux">news:450d4acf@linux...</DIV>That's =
what I=20
though...but don't you have to complete the circuit so to=20

speak

"DJ" <<A=20
=
href=3D"mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net">animix_spam-this-ahole=
_@animas.net>=20
wrote in message
<A=20
href=3D"news:450d48cc@linux">news:450d48cc@linux...
> Send =
the=20
analog output to an insert point in the Paris =
patchbay.
>
> "Don=20
Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> =
wrote in=20
message <A =
href=3D"news:450d45bb@linux">news:450d45bb@linux...
>>=20
I would like to check my 8 out cards before I finalise their sale =
and=20
as
>> I've never had to use them the really friggin' dumb Q =

is
>>
>> how do I get the audio on track 1 out of =
output 1=20
on the first card (S3)
> and
>> audio on track 9 out =
the=20
output 1 on my second card (S4)
>>
>>=20
D
>>
>>
>
>

</BLOCKQUOTE>
<DIV>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, =
and=20
you?
<A=20
=
href=3D"http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html">http://www.polesoft.com/refer=
..html </DIV></BLOCKQUOTE ></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0128_01C6DA43.AC8BB9A0--"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450cfaab\$1@linux...

>>As a US citizen, I feel like I have been put on the list by the
>>unconscionable
>>actions of our government.
>>
>>Torture, sure.
>
> There is no torture, not by any sane definition of the word.

hehe, classic.Check it...

<http://www.microsoft.com/technet/security/bulletin/MS03-007.msp>

Are you running Service Pack 2?

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>This just started happening.
>
>I shut down Paris and get the first notice....clicking on "click here" gets

>the second image and clicking on "click here" brings up an error report
that
>is all gobbledee-gook to me - many modules listed the a whole wack of
>numbers and letters
>
>Running on a PC with XP
>
>
>
>One man's obvious truth is another man's propaganda.

Factual truth is not the same as spin. Whatever you believe, (I'm not speaking here of you specifically, Chris, but anyone), if you think people who disagree with you are simply blind, you may be experiencing confirmation bias.

A possible treatment for this is to find a friend who disagrees with you, sit down with them, and really listen to their reasoning. Hold your knee-jerk responses in check. Then find another friend with another point of view and do the same. If you are particularly brave, talk with strangers. You don't have to lose your point of view, but use these conversations as an opportunity to drop any internal defensive system and try, for a moment, to see things from someone else's point of view without promoting your own. It's a healthy brain exercise. We may find

it's easier to love others when we operate from inclusively rather than defensive insecurity.

Those of us who live in free countries MUST live with disagreement. Disagreement makes free systems much stronger than systems that rigidly enforce a single point of view, because free systems examine problems from more than one perspective. The best solutions may come from a combination of perspectives. At the very least there will be more solutions from which to choose.

It's therefore healthy that we can have disagreements and enjoy discussions to explore them.

It's just as important that within these discussions at least some listening take place. If it's all mere preaching to respective exclusive choirs then it becomes a sort of babble.

I think most people can agree that fanatical, power hungry ideologues attempting to recruit others to kill for them are a danger to civilized society.

If an authority figure encourages a person to feel cornered and desperate, and then asks for his support in the context of that fear, the person could willingly become a pawn to the authority figure's aims. The person could, through manipulation of his own confirmation bias, feel rewarded by following a movement, even a destructive movement.

Confirmation bias is a reward within the brain when you find information that seems to support your own beliefs while generally ignoring even factual information that contradicts what you believe. From there the human talent of rationalization can kick in with the ability to feel smug and superior over those who "simply cannot see." And thus we don our own ironic blinders.

It can happen to anyone anywhere. It appears to be one of the trailer hitches on the human brain by which you can be towed willingly along while believing you are the driver.

It makes us susceptible, even receptive, to half-truths and even outright lies. We can be misled by scapegoating. Herded by pride. Become parrots of spin and stake our lives on propaganda.

Fanatical nationalism, fanatical religious fervor, these can be harnessed as Machiavellian tools by con artists, wannabe kings, despots, technocrats and theocrats alike. It can happen anywhere.

We are not immune, but we are stronger by having a culture of free thinking, respectful listening and vigorous discussion. Still, we are

NOT immune.

The price of freedom is eternal vigilance.

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

Chris Latham wrote:

> Well stated!!!

> It just amazes me how blind some people and the mainstream media can be to

> obvious TRUTH!

>

> CL

>

>You should have paris and the effects subsystem in add remove programs and in device manager you can uninstall the scherzo drivers if I remember correctly.

John

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>Sorry wrong question...I have the drivers...where are they located in my

>computer and can they be deleted and reinstalled without uninstalling Paris

>

>Don

>

>

>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message [news:450d3c18\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:450d3c18$1@linux...)

>>

>> I thought they were on www.parisfaq.com but I don't see em. I have em on

>> my server if you can't find em, let me know and I'll upload them to

>> yousendit.com

>>

>> There are three pieces to paris xp. Scherzo driver, Paris app and effects

>> subsystem. You should be able to add remove programs for the subsystem

>> and Paris. Everything only takes 5 mins so I would backup your "default

>> project.ppj",

>> paris.cfg and the "effects.var" (i forget it's real name). Remove all and

>> reinstall in order...scherzo, paris, subsystem.

>>

>> John

>>

>>

>> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>>>Also can I delete them and reinstall them without deleting and
>>>reinstalling
>>
>>>Paris?
>>>
>>>Don
>>>
>>>
>>>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:450d2a0c@linux...
>>>> what folder
>>>>
>>>> I'm on a PC using XP
>>>>
>>>> Don
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and
>>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
>
>.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if your
>assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about now.
>We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a
>howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we only
>kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it harder
and
>harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't got
the
>common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very disturbing
>to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).

>
>
>
>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...
>>
>> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and obliterate
>> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with Kissinger's
>> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and knew
>> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.
>>
>> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and
>> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
>>

>> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone who
>> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't know
>> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I percieve Kissinger had.
>Also,
>> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but
he
>> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.
>>
>> John
>>
>>
>
>Hi Sarah,

No one said you had to support Bush to not support terrorists, at least I never did. It really doesn't help your argument to use sarcasm though.

I am referring to the ideology that has been growing in our country for many years - way before Bush 1, or Reagan for that matter. It has nothing to do with Bush 2. I was talking about the world's view of Islam in light of the Pope's comments, so the fact that he keeps coming up as the response, regardless of the original topic, just shows that we would rather blame Bush than address what is happening in the world and in our country's ideology - the people, not the government. The government has nothing to do with the belief systems and relativism that is pervading our culture, media, schools, streets, conversations - it's just a side topic for Monday morning water cooler talk by pale comparison - one that ebbs and flows in the tide of that ideology of the people.

After Bush leaves office I believe we will see the greatest surge of relativistic and chaotic thinking in our history as a reaction of counter-instinct. It isn't about supporting Bush, and I'm not "blaming" the coming reaction on a lack of support for Bush - I couldn't care less if you like him - it's been coming regardless. I don't hate Bush, but I don't like him as a President either. I support our country though and want to see it become a great and revered nation solely for it's commitment to caring about and aiding people that can't help themselves, but that is probably wishful thinking.

I can see past the political fears and ideology to understand that we were also in serious danger during Reagan's years (Russia), Bush 1, and Clinton too as terrorism worked on plans for 9/11 and more that we've since averted, simply because the FBI, CIA and other police are on the vigil more than before. We created the political climate we live with administration after administration - one of deals and compromise to keep the right people happy. It's better than many alternatives, but in way it just propagates a lack of significant positive change in exchange for subtly slow moral decay, since

it in and of itself, and our competitive commerce driven society promotes a lack of integrity. Until people (everyone, not just leaders) are willing to risk money, careers, notoriety and stability to stand for something of more substance than sustaining the nice house, car and happy-go-lucky lifestyle we enjoy here, we will continue to cower to the whims of politics and the special interest flavor of the day instead.

I do agree that there is more than one way to fight terrorism - yes, 3, 4 5, maybe 100,000,000. Waging "war" on Islam isn't the answer. But assuming this terror war is simply another political disagreement that can be diplomatically solved with embargos and slaps on the wrist by the UN is also overly optimistic - if only, really I wish it were. I'm not saying you think it is - just making a point.

Truthfully, I don't believe we will ever "win" the war on terror, or rather the ideology that is behind it. We will just delay it for a few years here and there over the next 10, 20, maybe more if we are lucky. But, eventually we will lose, and lose badly, simply because we as a nation don't have an ideology that is stronger, more grounded, and more committed than theirs.

Then again, we really are fighting the wrong war, and I'm not referring to Iraq.

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/17/06 2:58 AM, in article 450d0c7e@linux, "Sarah"
<sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:

> I don't know if I'm a "leftie" (or a hippie for that matter), but I do know
> I'm definitely not blind. And here's another thing I'm not -- I'm not an
> idiot.
>
> Not being an idiot enables me to reason beyond simplistic black-or-white
> logic. In doing so, what I find "disturbingly amazing" is this oft repeated
> nonsense that if I don't support Bush's Crusade, I support the terrorists.
>
> NEWS FLASH: Scientists have concluded that there may be MORE than TWO
> approaches to the problem of terrorism. This should come as a relief to
> those who have believed that our only options are: 1. wage war on Islamic
> countries, or 2. do nothing. Yes, folks, there may be other possibilities
> in between those two extremes, as the recent thwarted terror plot in Britain
> demonstrates.
>
> "OK, smart-ass, what about Iran?" you may be asking about now. Yes, what
> about Iran? Shall we leave Iraq in the toilet and try the same thing in
> Iran and hope for a different result? Isn't that the definition of
> insanity? OK, you say, what if Iran gets a nuke or two? Yeah, what if? Do

> you think they're going to guarantee their own obliteration by lobbing nukes
 > into Israel? Or what? Isn't it possible that Iran notices that we haven't
 > even threatened to attack North Korea, the neglected "Axis of Evil" sibling?
 > Perhaps Iran is thinking, "If we have nukes, the US won't dare invade us."
 > That would be a logical conclusion on their part, don't you think? If Iran
 > is financing terror, we're going to need the help of our allies, if we have
 > any left, to deal with them. We're also going to need leaders a lot smarter
 > and more honest than the one's we've got.
 >
 > Here's a thought -- it occurs to me that in fighting the Nazis, Communism,
 > and now Terrorism that our real consistent enemy in all these is brutal
 > authoritarianism, AKA totalitarianism: we don't cotton to anyone trying to
 > violently force their beliefs upon everyone else. Well, wake up and smell
 > the despots, gang, because in our blind terror of Islamic extremists, we're
 > allowing the very thing we fight against to creep into our own government.
 > And this is proven every time someone is accused of "appeasing the
 > terrorists" because they oppose the "war" in Iraq.
 >
 > Look, once and for all -- NOBODY LIKES TERRORISTS, OK? Except other
 > terrorists. But this doesn't mean we should continue to let insane people
 > lead the charge against them.
 >
 > Love,
 >
 > Sarah
 >
 >
 > "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:450ca327@linux...
 >> I recall a similar irony, if that's the right word, during the Danish
 >> cartoon flap: Muslim fanatics using violence to protest the implication
 >> that Islam is a violent religion. Is it possible they didn't realize they
 >> were proving the validity of the cartoons? Hard to believe.
 >>
 >> Unfortunately, Osama bin Laden and others have much of the Muslim world
 >> convinced that the US is engaged in a war on Islam. Even more
 >> unfortunately, I think for some this actually is an unspoken motive in our
 >> "war on terror."
 >>
 >> To paraphrase John Lennon: imagine . . . no religion.
 >>
 >> Sigh,
 >>
 >> Sarah
 >>
 >>
 >> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
 >> news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...
 >>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found

>>> this ironic, at best:
>>>
>>> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
>>> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
>>> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
>>> year
>>> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Islam's founder) as "evil
>>> and
>>> inhuman" because of its command to "spread by the sword the faith". The
>>> Pope made no such characterization - just quoted the old guy, and it
>>> isn't
>>> even clear if he quoted any of the "offensive" text.
>>>
>>> As a protest, two Catholic, two Anglican, and one Greek church in the
>>> West
>>> Bank were attacked by Palestinians using guns, firebombs and lighter
>>> fluid -
>>> charring the churches and riddling them with bullet holes.
>>>
>>> Umm...reality check: $2+2=4$. The Earth still circles the Sun. And
>>> doesn't
>>> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then
>>> some?
>>> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
>>> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>>>
>>> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
>>> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
>>> response, not a crime.
>>>
>>> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
>>> to
>>> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
>>> rewriting
>>> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>>>
>>> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
>>> a
>>> cliff.
>>>
>>> Back to music...
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>
>>
>
>To find the crassest of the villains, follow the money.

Cheers,
-Jamie
<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

gene Lennon wrote:

> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>> Gene,

>>

>> If I actually believed this, I might agree with you. We've certainly
>> disagreed on a number of issues like this but I respect your opinion. I'm
>> sincerely interested to know if this is for real. I've got no problem with
>> people practicing their faith but I do believe that faith in something (like
>> armageddon) can definitely bring it about. I've read a number of articles
>> discussing the things you bring up here, but the sources were easily as
>> fanatical as they purported Bush to be.

>>

>> I agree that we may be living in the most dangerous time in the history

> of

>> the human race, but I don't see the same villain that you do.

>>

>> Deej

>>

>

>

> There is not just one villain, there are plenty of villains. Saddam Hussein,

>

>

> As a US citizen, I feel like I have been put on the list by the unconscionable
> actions of our government.

>

> if not hundreds of thousands of innocent people in the name of bringing them

> and put them to death without ever showing any evidence, why not.

>

> Well I do have a problem. It is NOT OK.

>

> I want my country back.

>

> It was never perfect. No country ever was, but we stood for something great,
> even if we sometimes had less than stellar moments. I know in my heart that
> if the Founding Fathers of the United States were alive today they would
> be calling for impeachment or revolution.

>

> presidents that were deeply religious, but if he thinks that all the wars
> and problems we are having in the world are actually a good thing because
> they have ignited a resurgence in Christian Values, we are in deep shit.
> GeneNot sure but it almost makes sense as the network is the latest and only
addition to my setup.

I'll have my guru check this out and see if he can remedy the situation

DOn

"Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:450d5f44\$1@linux...

>

> Check it...

>

> <http://www.microsoft.com/technet/security/bulletin/MS03-007.msp>

>

> Are you running Service Pack 2?

>

>

> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>>This just started happening.

>>

>>I shut down Paris and get the first notice....clicking on "click here"

>>gets

>

>>the second image and clicking on "click here" brings up an error report

> that

>>is all gobbledee-gook to me - many modules listed the a whole wack of

>>numbers and letters

>>

>>Running on a PC with XP

>>

>>

>>

>>

>But you stated that there seemed to be far to many people who were ready to
push a button.....etc. I disagree.

I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They have to
have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to negotiate
with though. What good did *diplomacy* with the Koreans or Arafat. To
dispatch envoys to discuss international affairs and foreign policy with
terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes them
and their tactics.

<http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=54> 26

Back around 1970 when I was studying political science, one of the the

required courses of study was international government and politics. This book was part of the required curriculum:

http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673_3.HTM

It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in the Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott International to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great job.....stay 18 months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it was considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli war ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company had to reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read the book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great interest. Also I had a friend who was an architecture student who was an Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and still do.

Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time so fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I ran across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the historical situation as has existed for many years

http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why.html

.....and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph wherein the author states:

It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs. Al Qaeda is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined governments. The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps we will see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus, which could bring progress in many other areas of international life. Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak to the majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties have yet to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced the brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy. In Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force but so far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity and peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have changed the world.

I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the autohateBush lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during this period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned the administration about the duplicity of those in the global community who were rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the UN Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most likely the destinations in Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his WMD's (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have done

things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service that was horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y

This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may not think these sources credible, but I think that historical reality has proved them to be correct:

<http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>

http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.asp

http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid e_x.htm

<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is especially disturbing)

Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice could go out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes of the past.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...

>

> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".

>

> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

> >>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button and

> >>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.

> >

> >.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if your
> >assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about now.

> >We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a
> >howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we only

> >kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it harder

> and

> >harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't got

> the

> >common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very disturbing

> >to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).

> >

> >

> >
> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...
> >>
> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and
obliterate
> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with
Kissinger's
> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and
knew
> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.
> >>
> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button
and
> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
> >>
> >> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone
> who
> >> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't
know
> >> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I percieve Kissinger had.
> >Also,
> >> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but
> he
> >> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.
> >>
> >> John
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
> >
>Interesting Deej and insightful.

There are so many issues involved, but one of the main topics as it applies
to the current situation is has Bush's policies and actions increased or
decreased that islamic fundamentalist support? It seems to be growing like
wildfire whereas it used to be embers.

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450da2d8@linux...
> But you stated that there seemed to be far to many people who were ready
> to
> push a button.....etc. I disagree.
>
> I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They have
> to
> have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to
> negotiate
> with though. What good did *diplomacy* with the Koreans or Arafat. To

> dispatch envoys to discuss international affairs and foreign policy with
 > terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes
 > them
 > and their tactics.
 > <http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=54> 26
 >
 > Back around 1970 when I was studying political science, one of the the
 > required courses of study was international government and politics. This
 > book was part of the required curriculum:
 > <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673> 3.HTM
 >
 > It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in the
 > Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott
 > International
 > to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great job.....stay
 > 18
 > months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it was
 > considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli war
 > ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company had to
 > reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read the
 > book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great
 > interest. Also I had a friend who was an architecture student who was an
 > Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and
 > still
 > do.
 >
 > Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time so
 > fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I ran
 > across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the historical
 > situation as has existed for many years
 > http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why.htm
 >
 >and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph
 > wherein the author states:
 >
 > It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs. Al
 > Qaeda
 > is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined
 > governments.
 > The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps we
 > will
 > see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus,
 > which could bring progress in many other areas of international life.
 > Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak to the
 > majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties have
 > yet
 > to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced the
 > brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy. In

> Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force but
 > so
 > far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity
 > and
 > peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have changed
 > the world.
 >
 > I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the
 > autohateBush
 > lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during
 > this
 > period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned
 > the
 > administration about the duplicity of those in the global community who
 > were
 > rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the UN
 > Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous
 > stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most likely
 > the destinations in Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his WMD's
 > (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have
 > done
 > things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service that
 > was
 > horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies
 > during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y
 >
 > This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may not
 > think these sources credible, but I think that historical reality has
 > proved them to be correct:
 > <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>
 > http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.asp
 > http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-side_x.htm
 > <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is
 > especially disturbing)
 >
 > Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good
 > information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice could
 > go
 > out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton
 > tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes of the
 > past.
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >

> "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...
>>
>> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".
>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button
>> >> and
>> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
>> >
>> >.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if
>> > your
>> > assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about
> now.
>> > We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a
>> > howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we
> only
>> > kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it harder
>> and
>> > harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't got
>> the
>> > common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very
> disturbing
>> > to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and
> obliterate
>> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with
> Kissinger's
>> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and
> knew
>> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.
>> >>
>> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button
> and
>> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
>> >>
>> >> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see anyone
>> who
>> >> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't
> know
>> >> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I perceive Kissinger had.
>> > Also,
>> >> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but
>> he

>> >> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.
>> >>
>> >> John
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>Cron,

I think this has less to do with Bush and Iraq and more to do with finding a time/place/excuse to wage this jihad. Iraq has provided all three, but I think it would be happening elsewhere and if not now.....soon.

;o)

"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message
news:450da43b@linux...

> Interesting DeeJ and insightful.

>

> There are so many issues involved, but one of the main topics as it
applies

> to the current situation is has Bush's policies and actions increased or
> decreased that islamic fundamentalist support? It seems to be growing
like

> wildfire whereas it used to be embers.

>

> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message

> news:450da2d8@linux...

> > But you stated that there seemed to be far to many people who were ready
> > to

> > push a button.....etc. I disagree.

> >

> > I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They have

> > to

> > have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to

> > negotiate

> > with though. What good did *diplomacy* with the Koreans or Arafat. To

> > dispatch envoys to discuss international affiars and foriegn policy with

> > terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes

> > them

> > and their tactics.

> > <http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=54> 26

> >

> > Back around 1970 when I was studing political science, one of the the

> > required courses of study was international government and politics.

This

> > book was part of the required curriculum:

> > http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673_3.HTM

> >

> > It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in the

> > Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott

> > International

> > to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great

job.....stay

> > 18

> > months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it was

> > considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli

war

> > ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company had to

> > reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read the

> > book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great

> > interest. Also I had a friend who was an architecture student who was an

> > Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and

> > still

> > do.

> >

> > Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time so

> > fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I ran

> > across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the

historical

> > situation as has existed for many years

> > http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why.html

> >

> >and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph

> > wherein the author states:

> >

> > It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs. Al

> > Qaeda

> > is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined

> > governments.

> > The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps we

> > will

> > see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus,

> > which could bring progress in many other areas of international life.

> > Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak to

the

> > majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties have

> > yet

> > to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced the

> > brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy. In

> > Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force

but
> > so
> > far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity
> > and
> > peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have
changed
> > the world.
> >
> > I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the
> > autohateBush
> > lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during
> > this
> > period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned
> > the
> > administration about the duplicity of those in the global community who
> > were
> > rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the UN
> > Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous
> > stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most
likely
> > the destinations oin Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his
WMD's
> > (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have
> > done
> > things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service that
> > was
> > horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies
> > during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y
> >
> > This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may not
> > think these sources credeible, but I think that historical reality has
> > proved them top be correct:
> > <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>
> > http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.as p
> > http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid e_x.htm
> > <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is
> > especially disturbing)
> >
> > Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good
> > information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice
could
> > go
> > out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton
> > tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes of
the
> > past.
> >
> >

> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...
> >>
> >> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".
> >>
> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> >> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button
> >> >> and
> >> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
> >> >
> >> >.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that if
> >> > your
> >> > assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about
> > now.
> >> > We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of a
> >> > howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that we
> > only
> >> > kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it
harder
> >> and
> >> > harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't
got
> >> the
> >> > common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very
> > disturbing
> >> > to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...
> >> >>
> >> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and
> > obliterate
> >> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with
> > Kissinger's
> >> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace and
> > knew
> >> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.
> >> >>
> >> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button
> > and
> >> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
> >> >>
> >> >> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see

anyone

> >> who

> >> >> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't

> > know

> >> >> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I percieve Kissinger had.

> >> >Also,

> >> >> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger but

> >> he

> >> >> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.

> >> >>

> >> >> John

> >> >>

> >> >>

> >> >

> >> >

> >>

> >

> >

>

>So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in today's world?

John

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>Cron,

>

>I think this has less to do with Bush and Iraq and more to do with finding a

>time/place/excuse to wage this jihad. Iraq has provided all three, but I

>think it would be happening elsewhere and if not now.....soon.

>

>;o)

>

>

>"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message

>news:450da43b@linux...

>> Interesting DeeJ and insightful.

>>

>> There are so many issues involved, but one of the main topics as it

>applies

>> to the current situation is has Bush's policies and actions increased

or

>> decreased that islamic fundamentalist support? It seems to be growing

>like

>> wildfire whereas it used to be embers.

>>
>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> news:450da2d8@linux...
>> > But you stated that there seemed to be far to many people who were ready
>> > to
>> > push a button.....etc. I disagree.
>> >
>> > I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They
have
>> > to
>> > have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to
>> > negotiate
>> > with though. What good did *diplomacy* with the Koreans or Arafat. To
>> > dispatch envoys to discuss international affiars and foriegn policy
with
>> > terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes
>> > them
>> > and their tactics.
>> > <http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=5426>
>> >
>> > Back around 1970 when I was studing political science, one of the the
>> > required courses of study was international government and politics.
>This
>> > book was part of the required curriculum:
>> > <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/0710306733.HTM>
>> >
>> > It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in
the
>> > Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott
>> > International
>> > to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great
>job.....stay
>> > 18
>> > months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it
was
>> > considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli
>war
>> > ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company
had
>to
>> > reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read
>the
>> > book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great
>> > interest. Also I had a friend who was an architecture student who was
an
>> > Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and
>> > still
>> > do.

>> >
>> > Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time
so
>> > fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I ran
>> > across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the
>historical
>> > situation as has existed for many years
>> > http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why.ht ml
>> >
>> >and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph
>> > wherein the author states:
>> >
>> > It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs.
Al
>> > Qaeda
>> > is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined
>> > governments.
>> > The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps
we
>> > will
>> > see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus,
>> > which could bring progress in many other areas of international life.
>> > Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak
to
>the
>> > majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties have
>> > yet
>> > to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced
the
>> > brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy.
In
>> > Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force
>but
>> > so
>> > far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity
>> > and
>> > peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have
>changed
>> > the world.
>> >
>> > I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the
>> > autohateBush
>> > lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during
>> > this
>> > period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned
>> > the
>> > administration about the duplicity of those in the global community
who

>> > were
>> > rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the
UN
>> > Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous
>> > stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most
>likely
>> > the destinations oin Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his
>WMD's
>> > (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have
>> > done
>> > things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service
that
>> > was
>> > horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies
>> > during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y
>> >
>> > This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may
not
>> > think these sources credeible, but I think that historical reality has
>> > proved them top be correct:
>> > <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>
>> > http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.as p
>> > http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid e_x.htm
>> > <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is
>> > especially disturbing)
>> >
>> > Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good
>> > information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice
>could
>> > go
>> > out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton
>> > tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes
of
>the
>> > past.
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".
>> >>
>> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>> >> >>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button

>> >> >>and
>> >> >>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
>> >> >
>> >> >.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that
if
>> >> >your
>> >> >assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about
>> > now.
>> >> >We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out of
a
>> >> >howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that
we
>> > only
>> >> >kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it
>harder
>> >> and
>> >> >harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't
>got
>> >> the
>> >> >common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very
>> > disturbing
>> >> >to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909\$1@linux...
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and
>> > obliterate
>> >> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with
>> > Kissinger's
>> >> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace
and
>> > knew
>> >> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button
>> > and
>> >> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> So, WHO today has this kind of diplomatic ability? I don't see
>anyone
>> >> who
>> >> >> clearly speaks in an effective measured, peace seeking role. I don't
>> > know
>> >> >> anyone who seems to have the cool head that I perceive Kissinger
>had.
>> >> >Also,

>> >> >> I'm not a history buff so I don't know everything about Kissinger
>but
>> >> he
>> >> >> always struck me as the ultimate diplomat.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> John
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>
>Hi Dedric,

No, you didn't say I had to support Bush to not support terrorists . . .
but that attitude is still out there, unfortunately, and some of the
responses to your original post reminded me of that. My initial response to
you was in complete agreement.

And I don't really disagree with anything you've said here except that I
don't think relativism is quite the threat you seem to see it as. Most
people don't take relativism to the extreme of justifying suicide bombers.
Also, rejecting ethnocentrism doesn't make one a cultural relativist,
speaking for myself. There is a middle ground there.

As for the sarcasm, sorry about that, but it helps me to diffuse my
anger about these issues.

Near the end of this post, you said, "But, eventually we will lose, and
lose badly, simply because we as a nation don't have an ideology that is
stronger, more grounded, and more committed than theirs." I think we do
have a stronger, more grounded, more committed ideology than theirs. It
involves concepts like unity, integrity, honesty, democracy, and, as we all
recited with hands on hearts in grade school, with liberty and justice for
all. These are sky high ideals that our country is found upon, and the
reason I get so angry and sarcastic is because it upsets me to see us drift
steadily away from those ideals.

Sarah

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C132C3AB.35B0%dterry@keyofd.net...
> Hi Sarah,

>
> No one said you had to support Bush to not support terrorists, at least I
> never did. It really doesn't help your argument to use sarcasm though.
>
> I am referring to the ideology that has been growing in our country for
> many
> years - way before Bush 1, or Reagan for that matter. It has nothing to
> do
> with Bush 2. I was talking about the world's view of Islam in light of
> the
> Pope's comments, so the fact that he keeps coming up as the response,
> regardless of the original topic, just shows that we would rather blame
> Bush
> than address what is happening in the world and in our country's
> ideology -
> the people, not the government. The government has nothing to do with the
> belief systems and relativism that is pervading our culture, media,
> schools,
> streets, conversations - it's just a side topic for Monday morning water
> cooler talk by pale comparison - one that ebbs and flows in the tide of
> that
> ideology of the people.
>
> After Bush leaves office I believe we will see the greatest surge of
> relativistic and chaotic thinking in our history as a reaction of
> counter-instinct. It isn't about supporting Bush, and I'm not "blaming"
> the
> coming reaction on a lack of support for Bush - I couldn't care less if
> you
> like him - it's been coming regardless. I don't hate Bush, but I don't
> like
> him as a President either. I support our country though and want to see
> it
> become a great and revered nation solely for it's commitment to caring
> about
> and aiding people that can't help themselves, but that is probably wishful
> thinking.
>
> I can see past the political fears and ideology to understand that we were
> also in serious danger during Reagan's years (Russia), Bush 1, and Clinton
> too as terrorism worked on plans for 9/11 and more that we've since
> averted,
> simply because the FBI, CIA and other police are on the vigil more than
> before. We created the political climate we live with administration
> after
> administration - one of deals and compromise to keep the right people
> happy.
> It's better than many alternatives, but in way it just propagates a lack

> of
> significant positive change in exchange for subtly slow moral decay, since
> it in and of itself, and our competitive commerce driven society promotes
> a
> lack of integrity. Until people (everyone, not just leaders) are willing
> to
> risk money, careers, notoriety and stability to stand for something of
> more
> substance than sustaining the nice house, car and happy-go-lucky lifestyle
> we enjoy here, we will continue to cower to the whims of politics and the
> special interest flavor of the day instead.
>
> I do agree that there is more than one way to fight terrorism - yes, 3, 4
> 5,
> maybe 100,000,000. Waging "war" on Islam isn't the answer. But assuming
> this terror war is simply another political disagreement that can be
> diplomatically solved with embargos and slaps on the wrist by the UN is
> also
> overly optimistic - if only, really I wish it were. I'm not saying you
> think
> it is - just making a point.
>
> Truthfully, I don't believe we will ever "win" the war on terror, or
> rather
> the ideology that is behind it. We will just delay it for a few years
> here
> and there over the next 10, 20, maybe more if we are lucky. But,
> eventually
> we will lose, and lose badly, simply because we as a nation don't have an
> ideology that is stronger, more grounded, and more committed than theirs.
>
> Then again, we really are fighting the wrong war, and I'm not referring to
> Iraq.
>
> Regards,
> Dedricl would love a web site or tv show that listed who our diplomats meet with
and what they report back and if any meetings with the "enemies" are public.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>
> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in today's
> world?
>
> John
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>>Cron,
>>
>>I think this has less to do with Bush and Iraq and more to do with finding
>a
>>time/place/excuse to wage this jihad. Iraq has provided all three, but
I
>>think it would be happening elsewhere and if not now.....soon.
>>
>>;o)
>>
>>
>>"justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message
>>news:450da43b@linux...
>>> Interesting Deej and insightful.
>>>
>>> There are so many issues involved, but one of the main topics as it
>>applies
>>> to the current situation is has Bush's policies and actions increased
>or
>>> decreased that islamic fundamentalist support? It seems to be growing
>>like
>>> wildfire whereas it used to be embers.
>>>
>>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>>> news:450da2d8@linux...
>>> > But you stated that there seemed to be far to many people who were
ready
>>> > to
>>> > push a button.....etc. I disagree.
>>> >
>>> > I think we've got plenty of diplomats in this administration.. They
>have
>>> > to
>>> > have something other than an ideological brick wall or a weasel to
>>> > negotiate
>>> > with though. What good did *diplomacy* with the Koreans or Arafat.
To
>>> > dispatch envoys to discuss international affiars and foriegn policy
>with
>>> > terrorists and Nazi maniacs like the Iranian prime minister legitimizes
>>> > them
>>> > and their tactics.
>>> > <http://www.iranfocus.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=54> 26
>>> >
>>> > Back around 1970 when I was studing political science, one of the the
>>> > required courses of study was international government and politics.
>>This
>>> > book was part of the required curriculum:

>>> > http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/catalog/data/071030/071030673_3.HTM
>>> >
>>> > It was of particular interest to me because I had a job lined up in
>the
>>> > Middle East with a company out of New Orleans named McDermott
>>> > International
>>> > to work in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. It was a great
>>job.....stay
>>> > 18
>>> > months and bring home an incredible amount of money tax free, but it
>was
>>> > considered dangerous duty over there, even then. The 1973 arab/israeli
>>war
>>> > ended up blowing my whole plan out of the water because the company
>had
>>to
>>> > reshuffle their experienced employees.....but anyway.....I read
>>the
>>> > book and quite a few others dealing with the middle east with great
>>> > interest. Also I had a friend who was an architecture student who was
>an
>>> > Iraqi American and we often talked about middle east affairs.....and
>>> > still
>>> > do.
>>> >
>>> > Anyway.....this part of the world has interested me for a long time
>so
>>> > fast forward to right after 911 but before the invasion of Iraq. I
ran
>>> > across this article which pretty much is spot on IMO about the
>>historical
>>> > situation as has existed for many years
>>> > http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/101501_why.htm
>>> >
>>> >and the most tragic part of it is the last paragraph
>>> > wherein the author states:
>>> >
>>> > It sounds like a daunting challenge, but there are many good signs.
>Al
>>> > Qaeda
>>> > is not more powerful than the combined force of many determined
>>> > governments.
>>> > The world is indeed uniting around American leadership, and perhaps
>we
>>> > will
>>> > see the emergence, for a while, of a new global community and consensus,
>>> > which could bring progress in many other areas of international life.
>>> > Perhaps most important, Islamic fundamentalism still does not speak

>to
>>the
>>> > majority of the Muslim people. In Pakistan, fundamentalist parties
have
>>> > yet
>>> > to get more than 10 percent of the vote. In Iran, having experienced
>the
>>> > brutal puritanism of the mullahs, people are yearning for normalcy.
>In
>>> > Egypt, for all the repression, the fundamentalists are a potent force
>>but
>>> > so
>>> > far not dominant. If the West can help Islam enter modernity in dignity
>>> > and
>>> > peace, it will have done more than achieved security. It will have
>>changed
>>> > the world.
>>> >
>>> > I have no reason not to believe (other than the rantings of the
>>> > autohateBush
>>> > lunatic fringe community who want to politicize everything) that during
>>> > this
>>> > period, had we possessed an intelligence service that could have warned
>>> > the
>>> > administration about the duplicity of those in the global community
>who
>>> > were
>>> > rearming Sadaam Hussein at the expense of the Iraqi people using the
>UN
>>> > Oil-For-Food program as their cover and the realities of the mountainous
>>> > stockpiles of munitions that have been converted to IED's and most
>>likely
>>> > the destinations oin Syria and elsewhere where Sadaam was moving his
>>WMD's
>>> > (I still think we haven't heard the last of this issue), we would have
>>> > done
>>> > things differently. Instead we got a "legacy" intelligence service
>that
>>> > was
>>> > horribly flawed. What we have discovered is that we had far more enemies
>>> > during the Clinton administration than anyone knew. Y
>>> >
>>> > This is the intelligence service that bush inherited. You may or may
>not
>>> > think these sources credeible, but I think that historical reality
has
>>> > proved them top be correct:
>>> > <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040414-124718-2114r.htm>

>>> > http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042903.as p
>>> > http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-07-24-intel-sid_e_x.htm
>>> > <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/535793/posts> (this one is
>>> > especially disturbing)
>>> >
>>> > Now what does this have to do with diplomacy? You have to have good
>>> > information in order to conduct diplomatic negotiations. Yeah, Rice
>>could
>>> > go
>>> > out there and negotiate with terrorists and the Korean lunatic. Clinton
>>> > tried it for 8 years. At some point you have to learn from mistakes
>of
>>the
>>> > past.
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >
>>> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d60c8\$1@linux...
>>> >>
>>> >> Just to be clear, my question is "Who are the diplomats of today".
>>> >>
>>> >> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
>>> >> >>There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button
>>> >> >>and
>>> >> >>have the 'problem' go away regardless of collateral damage.
>>> >> >
>>> >> >.....and where exactly do you get this info? Seems to me that
>if
>>> >> >your
>>> >> >assumption was right, North Korea would be a parking lot right about
>>> > now.
>>> >> >We have developed \$250,000.00 cannon shells that can be shot out
>of
>a
>>> >> >howitzer from 25 miles away and hit within 10' of a scumbag so that
>we
>>> > only
>>> >> >kill his human shields in the immediate vicinity. I'm finding it
>>harder
>>> >> and
>>> >> >harder to justify spending this kind of money on people who haven't
>>got
>>> >> the
>>> >> >common sense to take these people out themselves (and it's very

```
>>> > disturbing
>>> >> >to me that I feel this way.....but I'm beginning to).
>>> >> >
>>> >> >
>>> >> >
>>> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450d3909$1@linux...
>>> >> >>
>>> >> >> Don't confuse seeking peace with not having resolve to kill and
>>> > obliterate
>>> >> >> dangerous groups of people. I was just always impressed with
>>> > Kissinger's
>>> >> >> dialog. He struck me as someone who really really wanted peace
>>> >and
>>> > knew
>>> >> >> clearly the horrific consequences of not achieving it.
>>> >> >>
>>> >> >> There seem to be far too many people that just want to push a button
>>> > and
>>> >> >> have the 'problem' go away regardless of co
```

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 03:51:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

```
;>>>>>>> news:4509f8fc@linux...  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> What kind of mobo are you using Jimmy?  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in  
message  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> news:4509eda3@linux...  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I couldn't find any place where it indicated which IRQ  
> >the  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> AGP was  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> assigned.  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The IRQ page had all IRQs assigned to "PCI", and  
beneath  
> >> that  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> all  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> PCI  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> slots all assigned to "AUTO". On another page the  
serial  
> >> port  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> was  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> assigned  
> >> > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> to IRQ 4, and the parallel port was assigned to IRQ 7.  
> So
```


Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 04:18:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Page 97 of 416 ---- Generated from The PARIS Forums

>
> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:450b5efb@linux...
> > Why don't they still make them?
> >
> > Dammit!
> >
> > Jimmy
> >
> >
> > "Mike Audet" <mike@....> wrote in message news:450a8f1f\$1@linux...
> > >
> > > I just finished a rush session. They needed 10 copies of the CD, and
> > > I
> > > suggested
> > > that we check it out in the car before committing to 10 copies. The
> > NS10s
> > > were bang on. No tweaking needed. Reverb levels, vocal levels, eq,
> > > everything
> > > - bang on - and bang on despite the car system sounding very
> > different.
> > > These
> > > things are worth their weight in gold.
> > >
> > > I was also able to fix a problem in the accoustic guitar track that
> > they
> > > brought with them. I could hear the problem at 1k immediately.
> > Didn't
> > > even
> > > need to sweep the eq.
> > >
> > > These represent the best money I have ever spent.
> > >
> > > Cheers!
> > >
> > > Mike
> >
> >
>
> The real irony here is that the head of the Catholic Church would dare to
> criticize anybody, ever, for spreading religion with violence and brutality.

That is some serious irony right there.

Jimmy

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C131DB49.356D%dterry@keyofd.net...

> I don't want to start another religious or political thread - I just found
> this ironic, at best:
>
> The Pope is under fire from the Islamic community because he quoted a
> Byzantine emperor's ancient writings in a talk rejecting religious
> motivation for violence. The emperor, in obscure writings hundreds of
year
> old, characterized the teachings of Muhammad (Isl

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 05:06:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ircles the Sun. And
doesn't
> reacting with violence just prove the Emperor's assessment, and then some?
> Yet the press and the Islamic world seem to have missed the irony of this
> response, or at least are reluctant to admit it.
>
> The Pope's comment is getting more press than the fact that violence was
> actually perpetrated when the churches were torched. To note, this was a
> response, not a crime.
>
> Why are we (the world culture) so quick to defend Islam and work so hard
to
> avoid offending Muslims, regardless of the cost - even if it means
rewriting
> the definitions of peace and violence? Just something to think about....
>
> Ignorance isn't bliss, it's the last step one takes before falling off of
a
> cliff.
>
> Back to music...
> Dedric
> Good observations DC.

And if this newsgroup were put in charge of the country:

1. We would disagree on whether the White House comps would be PCs or Macs.
2. Cabinet meetings would refer to Marshall, Ampeg, etc.
3. Lobbying would refer to the noon jam session in the lobby
4. Bipartisan would mean we decided on both PC and Mac.

5. ProTools would mysteriously fall out of favor

(what? no, we would never do that...)

;-)

Dedric

On 9/17/06 4:32 PM, in article 450dccf6\$1@linux, "DC"
<dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>
> As long as we all have been yakking on these subjects, three
> things have happened.
>
> 1. No one switched sides
>
> 2. Everyone learned something
>
> 3. Almost all of us have gotten much more skilled in being
> nice to each other despite our differences.
>
>
> I don't know about the rest of you, but I am going to declare
> victory and have a beer...
>
> DC

Leap Symphonic Choirs going on this month that is very tempting.

It looks like there is a good chance it will reach its potential low price
of 398 (995 list) so this is a good opportunity to get it at discount, if
you need it.

The on-line videos are cool to check out even if you are not interested,
just to see the state of the technology.

<http://www.soundsonline.com/EastWest-Quantum-Leap-Symphonic-Choirs-Group-Buy-pr-EW-165G.html>

GeneThe idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
is absurd, I think.

Jimmy

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message

news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...

> Gene -

>

> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
a

> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.

>

> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
the
> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.

People

> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
country

> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
> do.

>

> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
any

> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
and

> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
> includes believing in nothing.

>

> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as a
sense

> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be

> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
 > might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better
 > than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
 disbelief
 > in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
 > respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
 > guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
 >
 > It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
 doesn't
 > like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
 > every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
 > over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
 > people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
 > would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
 view.
 > The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
 > country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
 it.
 > Yet another paradox.
 >
 > Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a
 > black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
 and
 > the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
 > believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
 balance
 > that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
 > thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
 > characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
 >
 > I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
 >
 > I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
 work
 > :-((....
 >
 > Regards,
 > Dedric
 >
 > On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
 > <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
 >
 > >
 > > Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
 > >> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
 > >
 > >

> > These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
> > administration
> > have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
> > perusing
> > the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
> >
> > Religion.
> >
> > If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
Awakening"
> > of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
> > it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
terrorists
> > (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
depicts
> > as "a confrontation between good and evil."
> > In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
(as
> > has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
> >
> > Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
> >
> > Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
down
> > hill from here.
> >
> > More on the "Third Awakening":
> >
[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201
59
4_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)
> >
> > Gene
> >
> Thanks for the tip Gene - I've considered getting this library for a while -
might have to take advantage of the buy. Could have used it on a project
this summer, but the budget didn't justify it.

Dedric

On 9/17/06 6:50 PM, in article 450ded62\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
<glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>
>

> Leap Symphonic Choirs going on this month that is very tempting.
>

> It looks like there is a good chance it will reach its potential low price
> of 398 (995 list) so this is a good opportunity to get it at discount, if
> you need it.
>
> The on-line videos are cool to check out even if you are not interested,
> just to see the state of the technology.
>
> [http://www.soundsonline.com/EastWest-Quantum-Leap-Symphonic- Choirs-Group-Buy-p
> r-EW-165G.html](http://www.soundsonline.com/EastWest-Quantum-Leap-Symphonic-Choirs-Group-Buy-pr-EW-165G.html)
>
> Gene
> Is there some way to get Cooledit going if you only have one drive?

It seems to want, ideally, two other local drives apart from your main system drive...

I'm trying to get it running on a machine with only one drive, but it won't play ball...

Cheers,

Kim. So I played a multi-band club gig this afternoon with the GNX4 going direct, balanced, to the PA and the tiny powered Galaxy monitor on a mic stand pointed at my guitar and ears. I asked the sound guy if he liked my "stack." (grin)

Turned out he's also a guitar player. He plays through an tube stack of his own and he was obviously underwhelmed by my stage gear. Being diplomatic, he said, "whatever works for you." But he didn't quite disguise a bit of stack snobbery. He obviously had low expectations for the rig.

Then we played our show. He had complete control, the guitar sounded huge through the PA (and the violin, which I also route through the GNX4, also sounded great). There were no stage volume issues. The band was tight, and we had a fun show. Afterwards I asked again if he liked my "stack."

He loved it. Said it sounded GREAT. Mind changed.

The next band had the requisite Marshall guitar amp, 4/12 cab and a similarly sized bass rig. Aimed strategically at the back of each player's knees and CRANKED. The sound guy had no chance to control anything in the moderate-sized club, Their set was mush from the getgo.

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

Jamie K wrote:

>
>

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 05:12:20 GMT

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

I'm with you TCB, speaker cabinets pointed at the backs of a player's
> legs do no good for the player, the crowd or the sound engineer. All
> they do is wreck the show. What good is great tone without the ability
> to do a great mix out front?
>
> I use a small Galaxy Audio monitor on a mic stand, pointed at my ears
> and my guitar (so I can still get screaming guitar feedback if needed).
>
> Out front it's all in the hands and ears of the engineer. Great guitar
> tone via a direct balanced XLR send. Stackless on stage. Engineers love
> that.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>
>
>

> TCB wrote:

>> You know, I've always thought a 2x10 1x12 might be the greatest cab ever.
>> But I'd want control over how loud the 12 inch speaker got. Now that I
>> think
>> about it the greatest sound I _ever_ got was recording once when I
>> borrowed
>> a Budda 2x10 cab and played it with my 1x12 Top Hat. I always thought
>> this
>> was because it was a sorta Vox/Marshall combination but I wonder if
>> the speakers
>> had more to do with it than I realized? Interesting question.
>> The guys in the band I'm in get kind of frustrated with me because I'm a
>> complete 'backline nazi.' If I get my way, and I'll usually whine until I
>> do, everyone's amp is pointed more or less directly at their head. I put
>> a power soak on my 15 watt amp, crank it up, and tilt it against a
>> wall or
>> get it up in the air. That's my version of in ear monitors, push the amp
>> into your ear;-)
>> TCB

>>
>> "AA" <AA@nospam.net> wrote:
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>> I know you've gotten lots of opinions, but I'll toss in two more.
>>>> For me,
>>>> live playing with a closed back 4x12 in a room much smaller than Giants
>>> Stadium
>>>> doesn't work well. The sound tends to 'beam out' in a very narrow
>>>> range,
>>>> usually directly at the guitarist's calves. So he turns up louder
>>>> and louder
>>>> until he can hear himself and then people near the stage are
>>>> hallucinating.
>>> Boy, as a sound man I agree wholeheartedly about this. That's why I
>>> elevate
>>> and tilt my cabs live... I usually fly direct emulated signal at the PA
>> and
>>> let them sweat the room. To be honest I use in ears about %99 of the
>>> time,
>>> and the cab is more for filling the hole in the center of the stage and
>> providing
>>> the right kind of vibration relationship to the guitar feedback....
>>> usually
>>> pointed right at me.
>>>> And not for a good reason. Second, I think 2x10 and 4x10 cabs sound
>>>> better
>>>> with 99% of the guitar/amp combinations out there. They lack some
>>>> low end,
>>>> which probably should be left for the bass in live situations
>>>> anyway, but
>>>> the entire midrange sounds way better to me usually.
>>> I'm still waiting for someone to make a hybrid 2x10/2x12 stereo cab.
>>> 10's
>>> sizzle and sing in the mids right, but they don't have the low end I
>>> desire.
>>>
>>>> I use a Top Hat combo that is basically a Vox AC-15 knockoff. Super
>>>> clean
>>>> is obviously not an option, but the single speaker sounds great.
>>>> However,
>>>> I tried it with a nice old 4x10 Fender cab it it was even nicer.
>>>
>>> All great info Thad, thanks for ringin' in man.
>>>
>>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>>> I'm looking at picking up a 4x12 to club gig with. Anybody got
>>>>> experience
>>>>> to

>>>> share with me about these models??
>>>> Is there 'really' a \$1000 dollars worth of difference in tone from
>>>> bottom
>>>> to
>>>> top with them, is it mechanics (like say, casters and handles)?
>>>> I will be driving it with a 60wpc tube amp with a tube preamp front
>>>> end.
>>>> I
>>>> want the elusive 'brown sound' distortion and super clear cleans...
>>>> which
>>>> the amp/preamp combo is certainly capable of giving me. It's the cabs
>> that
>>>> suck on my current gear (2 unmatched 2x12's) - I wish to move to
>>>> one stereo
>>>> matched cab, and I'm not afraid to rewire it if that matters.
>>>> Many thanks in advance!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> <https://www.zzounds.com/item--MSHMG412A>
>>>> \$450.00 \$279.95
>>>> Angled-front version.
>>>> Power: 120 watts
>>>> Impedance: 8 ohms
>>>> Speakers: 4 x 12 in. Marshall/Celestion custom-designed speakers (30W
>> each)
>>>> Dimensions (W x H x D): 26.4 x 26.4 x 14.0 in.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960A>
>>>> \$1,150.00 \$649.95
>>>> Angled-front version.
>>>> Black grille cloth
>>>> White piping
>>>> Black elephant grain vinyl
>>>> Speaker: 4 x 12 in. G12T-75
>>>> Power: 300 watt
>>>> Impedance: 4 or 16 ohms mono/8 ohms stereo
>>>> Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360mm
>>>> Weight: 36.4 kg
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AX>
>>>> \$1,500.00 \$1,049.00
>>>> Angled front
>>>> Vintage-circa early 70's
>>>> Checkered cloth
>>>> White piping
>>>> Medium size white logo

>>>>> Black Levant vinyl
>>>>> Gold beading on Cab
>>>>> Speakers: 4 Celestion G12 M-25w SPKR-00016
>>>>> Power: 100 watts
>>>>> Impedance: 16 ohm
>>>>> Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360 mm
>>>>> Weight: 37.7 kg
>>>>> Cover: COVR-00022 optional
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AHW>
>>>>> \$1,800.00 \$1,200.00
>>>>> Loaded with Celestion G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
>>>>> To complement the 1959HW's visual and sonic majesty, Marshall
>>>>> offers the
>>>>> 1960AHW (angled) 4x12 cabinet. It boasts basket weave fret cloth,
>>>>> metal
>>>>> handles, "100" logos, and is loaded with Celestion's highly-acclaimed
>>
>>>>> G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>Hey Jimmy,

No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are tons of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself tells me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of right and wrong on a societal and even global level.

To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point, what would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide what is right and wrong?

Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since everyone would make their own choices anyway?

Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.

Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.

Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person

or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.

Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying, cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be means of survival.

Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences between societies' definitions of right and w

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 06:04:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

rong, assuming societies even existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships, diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.

As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person, day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because their choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have prisons, or likely even organized societies.

But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?

If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either, or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it would just be another event in time.

But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With moral absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power in choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving God rather than a dictator or puppet master.

Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss

completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting, belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and 2) in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed and power in importance to life and survival together

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 07:01:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

r on this planet.

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
<johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
> is absurd, I think.
>
> Jimmy
>
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>> Gene -
>>
>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
> a
>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>
>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
> the
>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
> People
>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their

>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
> country
>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
>> do.
>>
>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
> any
>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
> and
>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>> includes believing in nothing.
>>
>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as a
> sense
>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better
>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
> disbelief
>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>
>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
> doesn't
>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
> view.
>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
> it.
>> Yet another paradox.
>>
>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a
>>

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 07:14:51 GMT

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

black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins

> and

>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in

>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the

> balance

>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very

>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible

>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.

>>

>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.

>>

>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of

> work

>> :-(....

>>

>> Regards,

>> Dedic

>>

>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"

>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>>

>>>

>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...

>>>

>>>

>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current

>>> administration

>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for

>>> perusing

>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.

>>>

>>> Religion.

>>>

>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great

> Awakening"

>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees

>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against

> terrorists

>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he

> depicts

>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."

>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble

> (as

>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.

>>>
>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>
>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
> down
>>> hill from here.
>>>
>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>
> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR20060912014_pf.html)
> 59
>>> 4_pf.html
>>>
>>> Gene
>>>
>>
>
>I have no desire to enter into

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 07:47:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

a debate about gods and religion. I am not
interested in proving any given point, or in converting you to a state of
mind similar to my own.

Jimmy

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C1336A39.35DE%dterry@keyofd.net...
> Hey Jimmy,
>
> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are
tons
> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
tells
> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of
> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>
> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
what
> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
> what is right and wrong?
>
> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no

- > basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
- > everyone would make their own choices anyway?
- >
- > Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
- > "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
- >
- > Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a
- proven
- > outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or
- > logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
- >
- > Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
- > and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
- experience
- > we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
- person
- > or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
- >
- > Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
- > cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be
- means
- > of survival.
- >
- > Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
- > between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even
- > existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of
- > inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
- > diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
- >
- > As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
- > absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the
- > choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an
- > ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
- > based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to
- person,
- > day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be
- > filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
- their
- > choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
- > prisons, or likely even organized societies.
- >
- > But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
- > absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
- >
- > If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
- either,
- > or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it
- > would just be another event in time.

>
> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With moral
> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we
> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power in
> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving God
> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>
> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way
> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and
> 2)
> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed and
> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
> > The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
morals
> > is absurd, I think.
> >
> > Jimmy
> >
> >
> > "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> > news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
> >> Gene -

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 08:03:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

br />

> >>
> >> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
> >> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
> >> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
> >> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
> >> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
> >> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
> >> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
> >> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
> > a
> >> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
> >>
> >> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
> >> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
> >> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
> > the
> >> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
> >> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
> >> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
> > People
> >> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
> >> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
> >> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our coun

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 08:25:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

try
> >> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
> > country
> >> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
> >> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
> >> do.
> >>
> >> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence

> > any
 > >> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
 > >> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
 > >> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
 > >> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
 > > and
 > >> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
 > >> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
 > >> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
 > >> includes believing in nothing.
 > >>
 > >> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
 > >> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as a
 > > sense
 > >> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
 > >> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
 > >> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
 > >> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better
 > >> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
 > > disbelief
 > >> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
 > >> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
 > >> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
 > >>
 > >> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
 > > doesn't
 > >> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
 > >> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
 > >> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
 > >> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
 > >> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
 > > view.
 > >> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
 > >> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
 > > it.

> >> Yet another paradox.
> >>
> >> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as
a
> >> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
> > and
> >> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
> >> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
> > balance
> >> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
very
> >> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
> >> characteristics of humanity - political and relativis

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 11:27:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

:-((....
> >>
> >> Regards,
> >> Dedric
> >>
> >> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
> >> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>>
> >>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
> >>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
> >>> administration
> >>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
> >>> perusing
> >>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
motivation.
> >>>
> >>> Religion.
> >>>
> >>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
> > Awakening"
> >>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he
sees
> >>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
> > terrorists
> >>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he

> > depicts
 > >>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
 > >>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
 > > (as
 > >>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
 > >>>
 > >>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
 > >>>
 > >>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
 > > down
 > >>> hill from here.
 > >>>
 > >>> More on the "Third Awakening":
 > >>>
 > >
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201>
 > > 59
 > >>> 4_pf.html
 > >>>
 > >>> Gene
 > >>>
 > >>
 > >
 > >

> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."

For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.

Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate scientific questions about reality.

While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.

However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities. Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently, about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on

religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a somewhat chaotic basis unless...

Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE WRONG. And people who believe in thos

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 13:04:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ons better than a system based on
any one religion (AKA a theocracy).

There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases. Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go from here, whenever we next get together.

Cheers,
-Jamie
<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

Dedric Terry wrote:

- > Hey Jimmy,
- >
- > No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are tons
- > of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself tells
- > me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of
- > right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
- >
- > To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point, what
- > would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
- > what is right and wrong?
- >
- > Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no
- > basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
- > everyone would make their own choices anyway?
- >
- > Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
- > "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
- >
- > Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven
- > outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or

> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.

>

> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger

> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience

> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person

> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.

>

> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,

> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be means

> of survival.

>

> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences

> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even

> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of

> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,

> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.

>

> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't

> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the

> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an

> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and

> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,

> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be

> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because their

> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have

> prisons, or likely even organized societies.

>

> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no

> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?

>

> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,

> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it

> would just be another event in time.

>

> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether

> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With moral

> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically

> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning

> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we

> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to

> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power in

> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving God

> rather than a dictator or puppet master.

>

> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way

> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss

> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,

> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and 2)

> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 13:08:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

trump greed and
> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
>> is absurd, I think.
>>
>> Jimmy
>>
>>
>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>> Gene -
>>>
>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
>> a
>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>
>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
>> the
>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>> People
>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country

>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>> country
>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
>>> do.
>>>
>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>> any
>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>> and
>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>
>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as a
>> sense
>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>> considering, a

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Nil](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 13:21:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

but fail to see any validity in
>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>> balance
>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>
>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>
>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
>> work
>>> :-(....
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedic
>>>
>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...

>>>>

>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>> administration
>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
>>>> perusing
>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>

>>>> Religion.

>>>>

>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>> Awakening"

>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>> terrorists

>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>> depicts

>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."

>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>> (as

>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.

>>>>

>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?

>>>>

>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>> down

>>>> hill from here.

>>>>

>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":

>>>>

>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)
>> 59

>>>> 4_pf.html

>>>>

>>>> Gene

>>>>

>>

>

`Kind of funny, Kelly sings with my buddy Ralph Saenz from The Atomic Punks
and Metal School. She's no longer a rock and roll virgin.

<http://us.video.aol.com/video.index.adp?pmmsid=1704499>Hi Jamie,

While those are certainly good examples of the common definition of faith,,
we shouldn't confuse faith in God with trust that event B will follow event
A. The latter can also easily be attributed to learned behavior. But not

all aspects of faith in God can be seen or experienced.

Hebrews 11:1

What is faith? It is the confident assurance that what we hope for is going to happen. It is the evidence of things we cannot yet see.

And no doubt that can apply to a falling guitar pick, though I doubt you hope that will happen during a gig. ;-)

How does one believe that there is life after death though, or that God is sovereign even over devastating situations? That is where the faith I refer to comes into play. And I would also propose that the same sense of faith we use to start a business, or enter into marriage, or believe that we'll see the next day, is part of the desire and drive that God has designed in us to propel us forward, and draw us to Him as well. It is a part of being human - a feeling, thinking, growing, individual.

The point was that moral absolutes aren't based on religion, and wouldn't be moral absolutes if they were. The idea of God-defined absolutes excludes the possibility that man could create or change that absolute.

By saying that man creates absolutes based on his religions says that his religion is false (created by that man), and therefore, no belief has any absolutes, and all beliefs are relative only to a single individual at a single point in time. We could extrapolate that to whether murder, rape and other acts we consider "hideous", but would have to conclude that all are right and none are wrong. The reason being that we would only be viewing them through our own created "right and wrong" and not anyone else's. That would also extrapolate to terrorists that kill people believing that it is Allah's will to destroy those that oppose them. But obviously we don't believe that is "right" any more than we believe Charles Manson was "right" to do what he did.

So where do we get the foundation for a "fair justice system" and "common sense"? If we have no reference point, then we must have just made it up. In that case, it's only relative to our perspective, and is neither right or wrong to anyone else, and maybe not all of the time for us either. If we created right and wrong, and we aren't perfect, then there is nothing stopping us from changing the rules when it suits us individually, regardless of the impact on others. Without that sense of governing authority that outlasts our governments, what holds us to be by very nature mostly "good", by most any definition?

What makes all of our choices seem to follow a similar core value system? If we have no common thread of belief in what is right and wrong, then why do most people (and likely all, even extremist terrorists) prefer peace to war; love instead of hate; fairness instead of injustice; truth instead of deceit? If there is nothing connecting us and superceding our own locally

relative decision process, then how could we have any sense of "common sense", much less right and wrong?

We see the evidence of these everyday. We easily agree as a world culture for the most part (excepting obvious deviations), that murder is wrong; stealing is wrong; laws should be obeyed, not abolished; etc. That is the evidence of unseen, never globally written in stone, but always pervasive moral absolutes. So in reality we all have faith that moral absolutes do exist, and if no individual created them (by the hypothesis that relativism would make them irrelevant), and all mankind just happen to adopt and hear about them without actual communication to propagate those beliefs, where did they come from if not from God?

Regards,
Dedric

On 9/17/06 11:14 PM, in article 450e2955@linux, "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>
> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
> way to the floor based on the gravita

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 13:31:26 GMT

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

tional attraction it has to the

> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>
> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
> scientific questions about reality.
>
> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>
> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.

> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>
> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY r

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 13:38:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

eligion. Well, you
> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>
> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is
> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to
> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as
> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no inces

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 16:08:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gt; <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>
>
> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> Hey Jimmy,
>>
>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are tons
>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself tells
>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of
>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>
>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point, what
>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
>> what is right and wrong?
>>
>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no

>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>
>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>
>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven
>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or
>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>
>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person
>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.
>>
>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be means
>> of survival.
>>
>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even
>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of
>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>
>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the
>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an
>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,
>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be
>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because their
>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>
>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>
>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,
>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it
>> would just be another event in time.
>>
>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With moral
>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we
>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to

>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power in
>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving God
>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.

>>

>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way
>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and 2)
>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed and
>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.

>>

>> Regards,
>> Dedric

>>

>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>>

>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
>>> is absurd, I think.

>>>

>>> Jimmy

>>>

>>>

>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...

>>>> Gene -

>>>>

>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
>>> a

>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.

>>>>

>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
>>> the

>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.

>>> People

>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of

>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>> country
>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
>>>> do.
>&g

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 16:17:14 GMT

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

t;>>
>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>>> any
>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>>> and
>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>
>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as a
>>> sense
>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better
>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>> disbelief
>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>
>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>> doesn't
>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>> view.
>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a

>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>>> it.
>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>
>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a
>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>>> and
>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>> balance
>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>
>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>
>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
>>> work
>>>> :-((....
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>> administration
>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>> Awakening"
>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>> terrorists
>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>> depicts
>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>> (as
>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.

>>>>>
>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>
>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>>> down
>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>
>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>
>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR200609120159)
>>> 59
>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>
>>>>> Gene
>>>>>
>>>
>>
> `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)My point is that faith is necessary for life, with or without religion.
Faith in a deity, faith in an afterlife, these are certainly examples of
faith. My point is that faith is not exclusive to religion.

Nor is a moral basis, a system of justice - these are necessary for
civilization, again with or without religion. Religion is fairly useful
in construction such a system, to the point that religions have been
invented to help cement power and define social organization. But that
doesn't mean a religion, or a universally acknowledged deity, is
required for that role.

It may be that you are having trouble groking the idea of morality
without a deity because you have so tightly associated the two in your
life, which is totally understandable. But what you propose is begging
the question. Others can make the distinction, and maybe it's worth the
effort to understand why.

There are many perspectives. For example a social libertarian
perspective. You own yourself. What you do with yourself is your choice
until and unless it interferes with someone else's ownership of their
own person. You can derive the rest from there. This is a pretty strong
start which certainly can allow for a law-based free society, including
religious freedom.

We are into a deep subject which is better discussed in person when people are willing to both talk and listen, as I have faith we are. :^)

I may be missing some of your intended points and I suspect we may be talking past each other somewhat in email. So since we don't live all that far apart, let's get together soon, explore the topic over a beer, and see what we come up with.

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

Dedric Terry wrote:

> Hi Jamie,

>

> While those are certainly good examples of the common definition of faith,,

> we shouldn't confuse faith in God with trust that event B will follow event

> A. The latter can also easily be attributed to learned behavior. But not

> all aspects of faith in God can be seen or experienced.

>

> Hebrews 11:1

> What is faith? It is the confident assurance that what we hope for is going

> to happen. It is the evidence of things we cannot yet see.

>

> And no doubt that can apply to a falling guitar pick, though I doubt you

> hope that will happen during a gig. ;-)

>

> How does one believe that there is life after death though, or that God is

> sovereign even over devastating situations? That is where the faith I refer

> to comes into play. And I would also propose that the same sense of faith

> we use to start a business, or enter into marriage, or believe that we'll

> see the next day, is part of the desire and drive that God has designed in

> us to propel us forward, and draw us to Him as well. It is a part of being

> human - a feeling, thinking, growing, individual.

>

> The point was that moral absolutes aren't based on religion, and wouldn't be

> moral absolutes if they were. The idea of God-defined absolutes excludes

> the possibility that man could create or change that absolute.

>

> By saying that man creates absolutes based on his religions says that his

> religion is false (created by that man), and therefore, no belief has any

> absolutes, and all beliefs are relative only to a single individual at a

> single point in time. We could extrapolate that to whether murder, rape and

> other acts we consider "hideous", but would have to conclude that all are
> right and none are wrong. The reason being that we would only be viewing
> them through our own created "right and wrong" and not anyone else's. That
> would also extrapolate to terrorists that kill people believing that it is
> Allah's will to destroy those that oppose them. But obviously we don't
> believe that is "right" any more than we believe Charles Manson was "right"
> to do what he did.
>
> So where do we get the foundation for a "fair justice system" and "common
> sense"? If we have no reference point, then we must have just made it up.
> In that case, it's only relative to our perspective, and is neither right or
> wrong to anyone else, and maybe not all of the time for us either. If we
> created right a

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 16:26:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nd wrong, and we aren't perfect, then there is nothing
> stopping us from changing the rules when it suits us individually,
> regardless of the impact on others. Without that sense of governing
> authority that outlasts our governments, what holds us to be by very nature
> mostly "good", by most any definition?
>
> What makes all of our choices seem to follow a similar core value system?
> If we have no common thread of belief in what is right and wrong, then why
> do most people (and likely all, even extremist terrorists) prefer peace to
> war; love instead of hate; fairness instead of injustice; truth instead of
> deceit? If there is nothing connecting us and superceding our own locally
> relative decision process, then how could we have any sense of "common
> sense", much less right and wrong?
>
> We see the evidence of these everyday. We easily agree as a world culture
> for the most part (excepting obvious deviations), that murder is wrong;
> stealing is wrong; laws should be obeyed, not abolished; etc. That is the
> evidence of unseen, never globally written in stone, but always pervasive
> moral absolutes. So in reality we all have faith that moral absolutes do
> exist, and if no individual created them (by the hypothesis that relativism
> would make them irrelevant), and all mankind just happen to adopt and hear
> about them without actual communication to propagate those beliefs, where
> did they come from if not from God?
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/17/06 11:14 PM, in article 450e2955@linux, "Jamie K"
> <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>

>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."

>>

>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.

>>

>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>> scientific questions about reality.

>>

>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.

>>

>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...

>>

>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.

>>

>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is
>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to
>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as
>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.

>>

>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.

>>

>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>
>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based on
>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>
>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go
>> from here, when

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 16:57:47 GMT

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

ever we next get together.

>>

>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

>>

>>

>> Dedric Terry wrote:

>>> Hey Jimmy,

>>>

>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are tons
>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself tells
>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense of
>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.

>>>

>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point, what
>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to decide
>>> what is right and wrong?

>>>

>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with no
>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?

>>>

>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.

>>>

>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven
>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning or
>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.

>>>

>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger
>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 17:09:09 GMT

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

>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person
>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.

>>>

>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be means
>>> of survival.

>>>

>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies even
>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form of
>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.

>>>

>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the
>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an
>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,
>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be
>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because their
>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.

>>>

>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?

>>>

>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,
>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it
>>> would just be another event in time.

>>>

>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With moral
>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we
>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power in
>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving God

>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.

>>>

>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way
>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and 2)
>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed and
>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.

>>>

>>> Regards,

>>> Dedic

>>>

>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"

>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>>>

>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong morals
>>>> is absurd, I think.

>>>>

>>>> Jimmy

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> "Dedic Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message

>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...

>>>>> Gene -

>>>>>

>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore car
>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope quote
>>>>> a

>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.

>>>>>

>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims might
>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
>>>>> the

>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to, and
>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different world
>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.

>>>> People

>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best, their
>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own

>>>> country
>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing to
>>>>> do.
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>>>> any
>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah the
>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>>>> and
>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims that
>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>
>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as a
>>>> sense
>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really better
>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>> disbelief
>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>>
>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>> doesn't
>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this forum
>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to take
>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to give
>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>> view.
>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>>

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 18:04:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>> it.

>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>
>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as a
>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>>>> and
>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>>> balance
>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>
>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>
>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
>>>> work
>>>>> :-(....
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he sees
>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>>> depicts
>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>>> (as
>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>>

>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>>>> down
>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>
>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>
>>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)
>>>> 59
>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>
>>>>> Gene
>>>>>
>> `
>It works fine on one drive Kim.
>Just set the local drives as different folders on the same drive.
>
--
Martin Harrington
www.lendaneer-sound.com

"Kim" <hidensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message [news:450dfb80\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:450dfb80$1@linux...)

>
>
> Is there some way to get Cooledit going if you only have one drive?
>
> It seems to want, ideally, two other local drives apart from your main
> system
> drive...
>
> I'm trying to get it running on a machine with only one drive, but it
> won't
> play ball...
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_00E3_01C6DADE.77255CD0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Deej,
Nurture this one.
Tom

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message =
[news:450e471d\\$1@linux...](mailto: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)

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?

<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

-----=_NextPart_000_00E3_01C6DADE.77255CD0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Deej,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Nurture this one.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Tom</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE=20
style=3D&q
```

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 18:19:49 GMT

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

20

software program that MRI machines are using these days. =20

Very
interesting guy. I'm mastering a project for his =
wife. He=20

was pretty
interested in the Paris program. His wife is pretty well =

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 19:07:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

our "God-given" intelligence which allowed that moral evolution.

The only problem I have with using the word "God" in any discussion of morals, reality, etc., is that there are too many different ideas of who, what, or if God is. Thus "God" becomes kind of a short cut, a metaphor for pretty much anything that transcends human understanding.

Perhaps as a courtesy to others involved in a discussion, if one is going to use the word "God," one should include a definition of the term. For example, if by "God" you mean the innate awareness of good that connects all of us spiritually, I'm down wit dat. If by "God" you mean a Big Guy in the Sky who fries his own "children" in a lake of fire, I'm probably going to ask questions, like, "Well, um . . . does he have a penis?"

"The stars up above are runnin' on love." - Captain Beefheart

Love,

Sarah

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C1339AF3.35E7%dterry@keyofd.net...

> Hi Jamie,

>

> While those are certainly good examples of the common definition of

> faith,,

> we shouldn't confuse faith in God with trust that event B will follow

> event

> A. The latter can also easily be attributed to learned behavior. But not

> all aspects of faith in God can be seen or experienced.

>

> Hebrews 11:1

> What is faith? It is the confident assurance that what we hope for is

> going

> to happen. It is the evidence of things we cannot yet see.

>

> And no doubt that can apply to a falling guitar pick, though I doubt you

> hope that will happen during a gig. ;-)

>

> How does one believe that there is life after death though, or that God is

> sovereign even over devastating situations? That is where the faith I
> refer
> to comes into play. And I would also prop

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [gene Lennon\[3\]](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 19:43:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ng" and not anyone else's. That
> would also extrapolate to terrorists that kill people believing that it is
> Allah's will to destroy those that oppose them. But obviously we don't
> believe that is "right" any more than we believe Charles Manson was
> "right"
> to do what he did.
>
> So where do we get the foundation for a "fair justice system" and "common
> sense"? If we have no reference point, then we must have just made it up.
> In that case, it's only relative to our perspective, and is neither right
> or
> wrong to anyone else, and maybe not all of the time for us either. If we
> created right and wrong, and we aren't perfect, then there is nothing
> stopping us from changing the rules when it suits us individually,
> regardless of the impact on others. Without that sense of governing
> authority that outlasts our governments, what holds us to be by very
> natur

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 19:57:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

y just be saying the
>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>
>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is
>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to
>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as
>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>
>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a

>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>
>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>
>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>> religion. And it can protect all religions

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 20:54:25 GMT

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

finitions of right and wrong, assuming societies

>>> even

>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form

>>> of

>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,

>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.

>>>

>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't

>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make

>>> the

>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be

>>> an

>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and

>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to

>>> person,

>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be

>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because

>>> their

>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't

>>> have

>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.

>>>

>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no

>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?

>>>

>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of

>>> either,

>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence -

>>> it

>>> would just be another event in time.

>>>

>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in

>>> whether

>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With

>>> moral
 >>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
 >>> drastically
 >>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
 >>> reasoning
 >>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when
 >>> we
 >>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
 >>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
 >>> in
 >>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
 >>> God
 >>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
 >>>
 >>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the
 >>> way
 >>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
 >>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
 >>> insulting,
 >>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
 >>> and 2)
 >>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
 >>> and
 >>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
 >>>
 >>> Regards,
 >>> Dedric
 >>>
 >>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
 >>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
 >>>
 >>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
 >>>> morals
 >>>> is absurd, I think.
 >>>>
 >>>> Jimmy
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
 >>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
 >>>>> Gene -
 >>>>>
 >>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
 >>>>> pretty
 >>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
 >>>>> the
 >>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
 >>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest

>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>>>>> car
>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
>>>>> quote
>>>> a
>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>
>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>>>>> religion
>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>>>> might
>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
>>>>> of
>>>> the
>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to,
>>>>> and
>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>>>> world
>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>> People
>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>>>> their
>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>>> country
>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind
>>>>> of
>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
>>>>> to
>>>>> do.
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and
>>>>> hence
>>>> any
>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to
>>>>> believe
>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
>>>>> the
>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in
>>>>> 24
>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a
>>>>> sad,
>>>> and
>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear -
>>>>> it's

>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
>>>>> that
>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
>>>>> also
>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>
>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and
>>>>> is
>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as a
>>>>> sense
>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then
>>>>> at
>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>>>>> President
>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>>>> better
>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>> disbelief
>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
>>>>> others?
>>>>>
>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>>> doesn't
>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
>>>>> forum
>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to
>>>>> take
>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to
>>>>> give
>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
>>>>> believe
>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>>> view.
>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 21:19:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

/>
>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>

>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201>
>>>> 59
>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>
>>>>> Gene
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>`
>Yes, Don, you win. And if you're ever in town, I'll let you have one of my
Drop Top Amber Ales, or a Black Butte Porter. :)

S

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450dccf6\$1@linux...
>
> As long as we all have been yakking on these subjects, three
> things have happened.
>
> 1. No one switched sides
>
> 2. Everyone learned something
>
> 3. Almost all of us have gotten much more skilled in being
> nice to each other despite our differences.
>
>
> I don't know about the rest of you, but I am going to declare
> victory and have a beer...
>
> DC
>Delay Compensation would be sweet !

"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:
>
>
>Deej,
>Nurture this one.
>Tom
>
> "DJ" <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)
>
>
>
>
>
>
>I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
>http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html
>
><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
><HTML><HEAD>
><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>
><STYLE></STYLE>
></HEAD>
><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Deej,</FONT></DIV>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Nurture this one.</FONT></DIV>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Tom</FONT></DIV>
><DIV> </DIV>
><BLOCKQUOTE=20
>style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
>BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
> <DIV>"DJ" <<A=20
> =
>href=3D"mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net">animix_spam-this-ahole=
>_@animas.net</A>>=20
> wrote in message <A=20
> href=3D"news:450e471d$1@linux">news:450e471d$1@linux</A>...</DIV>He =
>wrote the=20
> software program that MRI machines are using these days. =20
> Very<BR>interesting guy. I'm mastering a project for his =
>wife. He=20
> was pretty<BR>interested in the Paris program. His wife is pretty well
=
>known=20

```


> in the LA
music community and he digs this stuff. I may ask him if
=
>he could=20
> write a
delay compensation applet for Paris. He really got a =
>chuckle out=20
> of
Frankencomp.....said he's built a few similar monstrosities =
>

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 21:40:53 GMT

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

himself.=20

> They
will be back over here tomorrow=20
>night.

;o)

</BLOCKQUOTE>
><DIV>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, =
>and=20
>you?
<A=20
>href=3D"http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html">http://www.polesoft.com/refer=
>.html </DIV></BODY></HTML>
>
>Great post, thanks John
MR

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450b65d0\$1@linux...

>
> Nice Roger Nichols tips:
>
>
>
>
> Summary:
> Mix reverb of master mix back in with master mix.
> Split vocal to multiple verbs that trigger based on vocal volume (or ride
> faders on multiple channels with different verbs).
>
>
>
>
> Today we use individual sends on individual channels to send to individual
> reverbs, sometimes lots of them. One thing I have noticed with many older
> songs is that it sounds like there are not just certain instruments going
> to certain reverbs. Frequently it sounds like there is just one reverb
but,
> more importantly than that, it sounds like there's only one reverb send
and
> it's tapped off the master fader (either mono or stereo). I hear the kick
> drum, guitars, bass, vocal, strings, everything at mix-relative levels in

> the reverb. (I doubt this was a creative call, so much as a "necessity is
> the mother of invention" thing. I doubt there were aux sends on the
console,
> so they tapped from the master fader and sent it to a chamber and then
reinserted
> it into the stereo mix.) I can take a mix that sounds really far away from
> a classic 60s song and toss the "universal 'verb" on it and it transforms
> the mix to being nearly identical. It's a mix "glue" thing.
>
> I'm not saying this is a trick that will work for anyone today, but it
certainly
> makes a "new mix" sound a lot more like an "old mix" from 50 years ago.
Sometimes
> you just have t

Subject: Re: Terrorist plot foiled...Christians has Lost focus

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 21:47:39 GMT

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

o strip away 99% of the options we have today to get back
> to the methods and sounds they got back when they didn't have 99% of what
> we have today.
>
> I like to find one reverb and use it as a main reverb for the whole song,
> sending everything to it a little bit, says Nichols. Then for the vocal,
> I'll use three or four different reverbs, splitting out the vocal to
different
> tracks [or channels]. When t

Subject: So why do they want to kill us?

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 15:41:12 GMT

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

his command

> >

> > unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> > cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> > likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> > reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >

> > jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> > many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >

> > safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.

> >

> > reaction is not one of anger but a

Subject: Re: So why do they want to kill us?

Posted by [LaMont](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 16:22:40 GMT

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

ion of reason--unrestrained by God. They are united

> > by their self-worshipping world view.

> >

> > our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

> > Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of

> > Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French

> > Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor

> > Theodore Khoury of Munster.

> >

> > decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

> >

> > Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

> >

> > Both Islamist and s

Subject: Re: So why do they want to kill us?

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 17:00:02 GMT

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

ecularist seek to break God and reason apart.

> > Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe

> > absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization

> > carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> > both are in decline.
> >
> > Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> > with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> > of the allied forces on the western front.
> >
> > What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> > logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

> >
> > Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> > or even emotion vs emotion at the animal level?

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450ee547@linux...

> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is
> 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 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 w

Subject: Re: So why do they want to kill us?
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 18:16:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> > 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.
>> >
>> > In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the
>> > Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
>> > genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>> > Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>> > of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>> > analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>> > between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>> >
>> > Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>> > Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel
>> > II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there
>> > you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command
>> > to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
>> >
>> > Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
>> > unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>> > cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>> > likened the pontiff 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 rea

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [DC](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 18:57:33 GMT

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

nt jihad of propaganda is merely the flip
>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>>>
>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>>>
>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

>>> 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.
>>>

>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>

>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>

>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>>>

>>> 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 globalization

>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,

>>> both are in decline.

>>>

>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse

>>> of the allied forces on the western front.

>>>

>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>

>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.

>>>

>

>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

>Here, read this! The war with America started on 9/11.

>

><http://apnews.excite.com/article/20060918/D8K7B5UO1.html>

>

>Now how do we stop them? Talk to them, apologize to them, convert to Islam?

> Do you want to convert to Islam?

>

The key word is group.

A group of neo-Nazis won seats in this weeks elections in Germany.

http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/17/world/europe/17cnd-germany.html?_r=1&hp&ex=1158552000&en=ae34ff540e2ea150&ei=5094&partner=homepage&oref=slogin

This group does not speak for all Germans.

A recent NYT article talks about the infiltration of the US Army with skinheads.

of your skin.

<http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50713FE3B540C748CDDAE0894DE404482&showabstract=1>

This group does not speak for all members of the Armed Services or all Americans.

The world is filled with small groups of extremists, even here in the USA. The trick when dealing with them is to stop them without turning them into figureheads or martyrs. Our blundering has had the opposite effect.

On 9/11 a small group of extremists who were basically seen as outcasts by the majority of the Muslim world attacked our country. Our actions since have doubled and doubled again the scope and severity of this problem.

I am afraid you are right, if we continue on our current course we will turn this into a world war.

Geneand don't forget the welders goggles...orthe bactine for the burns.

On Mon, 18 Sep 2006 10:25:53 -0600, "DJ"
<animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>A Chip That Can Transfer Data Using Laser Light

>

>By JOHN MARKOFF

>Published: September 18, 2006

>

>SAN FRANCISCO, Sept. 17 - Researchers plan to announce on Monday that they
>have created a silicon-based chip that can produce laser beams. The advance
>will make it possible to use laser light rather than wires to send data
>between chips, removing the most significant bottleneck in computer design.

>

>The development is a result of research at Intel, the world's largest chip
>maker, and the University of California, Santa Barbara. Commercializing the
>new technology may not happen before the end of the decade, but the prospect
>of being able to place hundreds or thousands of data-carrying light beams on
>standard industry chips is certain to shake up both the communications and

>computer industries.

>

>Lasers are already used to transmit high volumes of computer data over
>longer distances - for example, between offices, cities and across oceans -
>using fiber optic cables. But in computer chips, data moves at great speed
>over the wires inside, then slows to a snail's pace when it is sent
>chip-to-chip inside a computer.

>

>With the barrier removed, computer designers will be able to rethink
>computers, packing chips more densely both in home systems and in giant data
>centers. Moreover, the laser-silicon chips - composed of a spider's web of
>laser light in addition to metal wires - portend a vastly more powerful and
>less expensive national computing infrastructure. For a few dollars apiece,
>such chips could transmit data at 100 times the speed of laser-based
>communications equipment, called optical transceivers, that typically cost
>several thousand dollars.

>

>Currently fiber optic networks are used to transmit data to individual
>neighborhoods in cities where the data is then distributed by slower
>conventional wire-based communications gear. The laser chips will make it
>possible to send avalanches of data to and from individual homes at far less
>cost.

>

>They could also give rise to a new class of supercomputers that could share
>data internally at speeds not possible today.

>

>The breakthrough was achieved by bonding a layer of light-emitting indium
>phosphide onto the surface of a standard silicon chip etched with special
>channels that act as light-wave guides. The resulting sandwich has the
>potential to create on a computer chip hundreds and possibly thousands of
>tiny, bright lasers that can be switched on and off billions of times a
>second.

>

>"This is a field that has just begun exploding in the past 18 months," said
>Eli Yablonovitch, a physicist at the University of California, Los Angeles,
>a leading researcher in the field. "There is going to be a lot more optical
>communications in computing than people have thought."

>

>Indeed, the results of the development work, which will be reported in a
>coming issue of Optics Express, an international journal, indicate that a
>high-stakes race is under way worldwide. While the researchers at Intel and
>Santa Barbara are betting on indium phosphide, Japanese scientists in a
>related effort are pursuing a different material, the chemical element
>erbium.

>

>Although commercial chips with built-in lasers are years away, Luxtera, a
>company in Carlsbad, Calif., is already selling test chips that incorporate
>most optical components directly into silicon and then inject laser light

>from a separate source.

>

>The Intel-Santa Barbara work proves that it is possible to make complete
>photonic devices using standard chip-making machinery, although not entirely
>out of silicon. "There has always been this final hurdle," said Mario
>Paniccia, director of the Photonics Technology Lab at Intel. "We have now
>come up with a solution that optimizes both sides."

>

>In the past it has proved impossible to couple standard silicon with the
>exotic materials that emit light when electrically charged. But the
>university team supplied a low-temperature bonding technique that does not
>melt the silicon circuitry. The approach uses an electrically charged oxygen
>gas to create a layer of oxide just 25 atoms thick on each material. When
>heated and pressed together, the oxide layer fuses the two materials into a
>single chip that conducts information both through wires and on beams of
>reflected light.

>

>"Photonics has been a low-volume cottage industry," said John E. Bowers,
>director of the Multidisciplinary Optical Switching Technology Center at the
>University of California, Santa Barbara. "Everything will change and laser
>communications will be everywhere, including fiber to the home."

>

>Photonics industry experts briefed on the technique said that it would
>almost certainly pave the way for commercialization of the long-sought
>convergence of silicon chips and optical lasers. "Before, there was more
>hype than substance," said Alan Huang, a former Bell Laboratories researcher
>who is a pioneer in the field and is now chief tech

Subject: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [Sarah](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 19:00:26 GMT

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

ltures."

>> >

>> > Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.

>> >

>

>Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our own.
There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

DJ wrote:

> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is 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 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 would have been an
>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.

>>

>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe while
>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>> actual way the solar system works.

>>

>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about
>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago, and
>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.

>>

>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence of
>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and who
>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.

>>

>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks
>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
>> hide behind Christianity to do so.

>>

>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to

>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in spreading
>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the focus
>> on the use of force.

>>

>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory. ;^)

>>

>> Have a great week!

>>

>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

>>

>>

>> DC wrote:

>>> I thought this was worth reading 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

>>> Regensberg, 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

>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.

>>>

>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>
>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>>>

>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>

>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>

>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>

>>> 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

>>> 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

>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>

>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

>>>

>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>>>

>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>

>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>>>

>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>>> lost on them.
>>>

>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [rick](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 20:04:30 GMT

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

se to accept as

>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.

>>

>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a proven

>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning

or

>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.

>>

>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse, anger

>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience

>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that person

>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.

>>

>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,

>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can be

means

>> of survival.

>>

>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences

>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies

even

>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form

of

>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,

>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.

>>
>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
the
>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be
an
>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,
>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
be
>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
their
>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>
>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>
>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,
>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
- it
>> would just be another event in time.
>>
>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
moral
>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when
we
>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
to
>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
in
>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
God
>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>
>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the
way
>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
and 2)
>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
and
>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>

>> Regards,
>> Dedic
>>
>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>
>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
morals
>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>
>>> Jimmy
>>>
>>>
>>> "Dedic Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>> Gene -
>>>>
>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
the
>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
car
>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
quote
>>> a
>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>
>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
might
>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
of
>>> the
>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to,
and
>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
world
>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>> People
>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
their
>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
of
>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country

>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>> country
>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind
of
>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
to
>>>> do.
>>>>
>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>>> any
>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
the
>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in
24
>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>>> and
>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear -
it's
>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
that
>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
also
>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>
>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and
is
>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as
a
>>> sense
>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then
at
>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
be
>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
better
>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>> disbelief
>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>
>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>> doesn't
>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
forum
>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to

take
 >>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to
 give
 >>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
 >>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
 >>> view.
 >>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in
 a
 >>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
 >>> it.
 >>>> Yet another paradox.
 >>>>
 >>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
 as a
 >>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
 >>> and
 >>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
 in
 >>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
 >>> balance
 >>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
 very
 >>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
 >>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
 >>>>
 >>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
 >>>>
 >>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
 of
 >>> work
 >>>> :-(....
 >>>>
 >>>> Regards,
 >>>> Dedric
 >>>>
 >>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
 >>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
 >>>>
 >>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
 >>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
 >>>>>> administration
 >>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
 for
 >>>>>> perusing
 >>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
 >>>>>>

>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>> Awakening"
>>>>> of the internat

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 20:17:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ional religious struggle. This is a good thing as he
sees
>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>> terrorists
>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>> depicts
>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>> (as
>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>
>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>
>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>>> down
>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>
>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>
>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR20060912015959_4_pf.html)
>>> 59
>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>
>>>>> Gene
>>>>>
>>>
>>
>`I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda just
came out with an ultimatum stating that it's full on war now and the west
will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to Islam. So
where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ee7ef@linux...
>
> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our own.
> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.

>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>
>
> DJ wrote:
> > It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is
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 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 would have been an
> >> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>
> >> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
> >> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
> >> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
while
> >> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
> >> actual way the solar system works.
> >>
> >> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
> >> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about
> >> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
> >> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
and
> >> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.

> >>
> >> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
> >> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
of
> >> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and who
> >> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> >>
> >> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks
> >> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
> >> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
> >> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
> >> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> >>
> >> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
> >> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
spreading
> >> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
> >> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
focus
> >> on the use of force.
> >>
> >> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.
;^)
> >>
> >> Have a great week!
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> -Jamie
> >> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> >>
> >>
> >> DC wrote:
> >>> I thought this was worth reading 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

> >>> Regensberg, 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

> >>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
> >>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>
> >>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> >>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> >>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>
> >>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> >>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> >>>

> >>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> >>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> >>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>>

> >>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> >>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >>>

> >>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>>

> >>> 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

> >>> 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

> >>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

> >>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>

> >>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

> >>>

> >>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> >>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> >>>

> >>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

> >>>

> >>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not

> >>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

> >>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

> >>>

> >>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is

> >>> lost on them.

> >>>

> >>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a

> >>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> >>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.

> >>>

> >>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in

> >>> the Islamist re

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [Sarah](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 20:52:19 GMT

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

action to the Pope.

> >>>

> >>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists

> >>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand

> >>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of

> >>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the

> >>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>>
> >>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> >>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

> >>> 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

Subject: Re: So why do they want to kill us?
Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 22:28:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

larist seek to break God and reason apart.
> >>> Each claims superiority over the Christian West. They believe
> >>> absolute moral license makes them powerful. As globalization
> >>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> >>> both are in decline.
> >>>
> >>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> >>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> >>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> >>>
> >>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 23:51:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

er-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>
> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make the
> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be an
> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to
> person,
> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either be
> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
> their

> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>
> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>
> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
> either,
> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence - it
> would just be another event in time.
>
> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in
> whether
> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
> moral
> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
> drastically
> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when we
> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option to
> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
> in
> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
> God
> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>
> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the way
> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept; and
> 2)
> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
> and
> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>
> Regards,
> Dedric
>
> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
>> morals
>> is absurd, I think.
>>
>> Jimmy
>>
>>

>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>> Gene -
>>>
>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even the
>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>>> car
>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
>>> quote
>> a
>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>
>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>>> religion
>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>> might
>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many of
>> the
>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to,
>>> and
>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>> world
>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>> People
>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>> their
>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat of
>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>> country
>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind of
>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
>>> to
>>> do.
>>>
>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>> any
>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to
>>> believe
>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
>>> the
>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in 24
>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,

>> and
>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear - it's
>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
>>> that
>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That also
>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>
>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and is
>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as a
>> sense
>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then at
>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should be
>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>>> President
>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>> better
>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>> disbelief
>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>
>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>> doesn't
>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
>>> forum
>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to
>>> take
>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to
>>> give
>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
>>> believe
>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>> view.
>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in a
>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>> it.
>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>
>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world as
>>> a
>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>> and
>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity in
>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>> balance
>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the very
>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible

>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>
>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>
>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours of
>> work
>>> :-(....
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Dedric
>>>
>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>> administration
>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons for
>>>>> perusing
>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>
>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>> Awakening"
>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he
>>>>> sees
>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>> terrorists
>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>> depicts
>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>> (as
>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>
>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>
>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go
>> down
>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>
>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>

>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201>
>> 59
>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>
>>>> Gene
>>>>
>>>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 01:34:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

rld,
>> >>> both are in decline.
>> >>>
>> >>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist
>> >>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke their pact
>> >>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>> >>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>> >>>
>> >>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to
>> >>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the Byzantine
>> >>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos (word or
>> >>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to this great
>> >>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in
>> >>> the dialogue of cultures."
>> >>>
>> >>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>> >>>
>> >
>> >
>
>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Here, read this! The war with America started on 9/11.
>>
>><http://apnews.excite.com/article/20060918/D8K7B5UO1.html>
>>
>>Now how do we stop them? Talk to them, apologize to them, convert to Islam?
>> Do you want to convert to Islam?
>>
>
>
>

>
>The key word is group.
>
>
>A group of neo-Nazis won seats in this weeks elections in Germany.
>
> http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/17/world/europe/17cnd-germany.html?_r=1&hp&ex=1158552000&en=ae34ff540e2ea150&ei=5094&partner=homepage&oref=slogin
>
>This group does not speak for all Germans.
>
>A recent NYT article talks about the infiltration of the US Army with skinheads.

color
>of your skin.
>
> <http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50713FE3B540C748CDDAE0894DE404482&showabstract=1>
>
>This group does not speak for all members of the Armed Services or all Americans.
>
>The world is filled with small groups of extremists, even here in the USA.
>The trick when dealing with them is to stop them without turning them into
>figureheads or martyrs. Our blundering has had the opposite effect.
>
>On 9/11 a small group of extremists who were basically seen as outcasts
by
>the majority of the Muslim world attacked our country. Our actions since
>have doubled and doubled again the scope and severity of this problem.
>
>I am afraid you are right, if we continue on our current course we will
turn
>this into a world war.
>
>Gene
>

By the way Gene, we didn't start it they did, remember 9/11."Sarah"
<sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>Yes, Don, you win. And if you're ever in town, I'll let you have one of
my
>Drop Top Amber Ales, or a Black Butte Porter. :)
>
>S

Just to be clear, my definition of victory was "not fighting",

rather than my having won the argument.

Someone is right here, and someone is wrong. If I am right, you and some others will have some serious crow to eat. If you are right, likewise for me and some others.

There is a point at which it is clear that no minds will change. We have reached that point.

In the future, I would like us to commiserate together, rather than say "I told you so" because the possible result of either position could just ****SUCK**** huh?

Hence the "declaration".

DC

ps

Good friend of mine, (not a bushie by any means) dared to ask some of his friends what their plan was, should the jihadis, not the president, show themselves to be the real issue here. these antiwar folks (long time friends of his BTW)literally started yelling, spluttering and *chanting slogans* in his face! We have avoided that. That is a victory.

So have a beer, and consider if the other guy has a point.

>
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450dccf6\$1@linux...
>>
>> As long as we all have been yakking on these subjects, three
>> things have happened.
>>
>> 1. No one switched sides
>>
>> 2. Everyone learned something
>>
>> 3. Almost all of us have gotten much more skilled in being
>> nice to each other despite our differences.
>>
>>
>> I don't know about the rest of you, but I am going to declare
>> victory and have a beer...
>>

>> DC
>>
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>I don't think we are going to have a choice. WHEN they take out a couple
>of American cities, will you still believe in talk? Will you care what
the
>rest of the world thinks of us?
>
>We should have crossed the border in to Pakistan and got Bin laden, now
what?
> Their not going to stop. The people or countries that harbor al-Qaida
are
>the enemies of the US. The head of the CIA said that they have a "vary
excellent
>idea of where Osama Bin laden is", but for political reasons they can't
go
>get him. So who do you think is protecting him?
>
>There is a lot more I could say, but the bottom line is we don't have the
>guts to do what is necessary. There are too many people in our country
that
>are weak minded and weak willed. They know they can destroy us because
our
>people are weak and divided.
>
>Think about who has been against us the whole way. There is a much bigger
>picture.
>
>James
>

A purely pragmatic question.

If the worst happens and a WMD goes off in a major US city, what would the appropriate response be?

answer.

ourselves, but if the responsible people are a small percentage of the population of a country or region, what should we do? Nuke the Middle East?

This is the time we should be talking about it. If we wait till it happens we will be caught up in the moment and we could make decisions that literally end civilization.

I lost friends on 9/11. I have not forgotten. However, I do not blame innocent people for the actions of others.

Our government!

GeneWe can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

TCB wrote:

> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals take
> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have faith.
> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>
>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>
>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>
>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
>
>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
>
>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>> scientific questions about reality.
>>
>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>
>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>
>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
>
>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on

>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>
>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
>
>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
>
>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>
>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that is
>
>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right to
>
>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such as
>
>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>
>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
>
>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>
>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>
&

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [macle](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 01:53:44 GMT

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

>> 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 would have been an
>> >> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>> >>

>> >> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>> >> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
>> >> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
> while
>> >> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>> >> actual way the solar system works.
>> >>
>> >> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>> >> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about
>> >> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
>> >> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
> and
>> >> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>> >>
>> >> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
>> >> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
> of
>> >> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
>> >> who
>> >> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>> >>
>> >> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
>> >> bucks
>> >> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
>> >> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
>> >> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
>> >> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>> >>
>> >> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
>> >> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> spreading
>> >> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
>> >> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
> focus
>> >> on the use of force.
>> >>
>> >> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.
> ;^)
>> >>
>> >> Have a great week!
>> >>
>> >> Cheers,
>> >> -Jamie
>> >> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> DC wrote:
>> >>> I thought this was worth reading 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.
>> >>>
>> >>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the
>> >>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
>> >>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>> >>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>> >>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>> >>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>> >>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>> >>>
>> >>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>> >>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel
>> >>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there
>> >>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command
>> >>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
>> >>>
>> >>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
>> >>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>> >>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>> >>> likened the pontiff 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. 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 saying
>> >>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>> >>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
>> >>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this jihad.
>> >>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your 'spiritual'
>> >>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>> >>>

>> >>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The

>> >>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the flip
>> >>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>> >>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
>> >>>
>> >>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>> >>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>> >>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>> >>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>> >>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
>> >>>
>> >>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>> >>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:
>> >>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." 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
>> >>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is
>> >>>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 03:27:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

/>
>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
> the
>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only be
> an
>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time, and
>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to person,
>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
> be
>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
> their
>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't have
>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>
>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no
>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?

>>>
>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of either,
>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
> - it
>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>
>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in whether
>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
> moral
>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when
> we
>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
> to
>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
> in
>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
> God
>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>
>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the
> way
>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
> and 2)
>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
> and
>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>
>>> Regards,
>>> Detric
>>>
>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
> morals
>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>
>>>> Jimmy
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Detric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>

>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response pretty
>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
> the
>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence and
>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
> car
>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured and
>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
> quote
>>>> a
>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>
>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting religion
>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
> might
>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
> of
>>>> the
>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked to,
> and
>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
> world
>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>> People
>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
> their
>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
> of
>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>>> country
>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind
> of
>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
> to
>>>>> do.
>>>>>
>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and hence
>>>> any
>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to believe
>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
> the
>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments in
> 24
>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a sad,
>>>> and

>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear -
> it's
>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
> that
>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
> also
>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>
>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and
> is
>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope as
> a
>>>>> sense
>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then
> at
>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
> be
>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
> better
>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>> disbelief
>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point for
>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in any
>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>>
>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>>> doesn't
>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
> forum
>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent to
> take
>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is to
> give
>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not believe
>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>>> view.
>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in
> a
>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to outlaw
>>>>> it.
>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>
>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
> as a
>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always wins
>>>>> and
>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity

> in
>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>>> balance
>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
> very
>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>
>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>
>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
> of
>>>> work
>>>> :-((....
>>>>
>>>> Regards,
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>> administration
>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
> for
>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as he
> sees
>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>> terrorists
>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>>> depicts
>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>>> (as
>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily go

>>>> down
>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>
>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>
>>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR200609120159)
>>>> 59
>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>
>>>>> Gene
>>>>>
>> `
>"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>Hi Dedric,
>
>Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a higher

>power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason that

>the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an atheist

>knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I think

>the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as
>empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the very

>broad sense. Now, how we got to the point where we feel such a vast nu

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 04:34:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

br />
>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
> while
>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>
>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only about
>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
> and
>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>>>

>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
> of
>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and who
>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>
>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks
>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to
>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>
>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> spreading
>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
> focus
>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>
>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.
> ;^)
>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>> I thought this was worth reading 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

>>>>> Regensberg, 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

>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.

>>>>>

>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between

>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash

>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His

>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance

>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.

>>>>>

>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.

>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>>>>>

>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite

>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party

>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of

>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.

>>>>>

>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that

>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>>>

>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.

>>>>>

>>>>> 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

>>>>> 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

>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>

>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

>>>>>

>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>>>>>

>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>>>

>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not

>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>>>>>

>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is

>>>>> lost on them.

>>>>>

>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a

>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.

>>>>>

>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in

>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.

>>>>>

>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists

>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand

>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of

>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the

>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.

>>>>>

>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist

>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

>>>>> 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.
>>>>>

>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>>>

>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>>>
>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>>>>>
>>>>> 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 globalization
>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>>>>> both are in decline.

>>>>>
>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.

>>>>>
>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>>>
>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>>>>
>>>
>
>"Without God, all is permitted."

A few questions about that assertion:

- 1) Which God? Your God or anyone's God? If your God, are you then asking for everyone to convert? If everyone doesn't convert will there be a head tax on those who don't?
- 2) When considering the non-deity case, why should we assume a sociopath as the arbiter of morality?
- 3) Pretty much all HAS been permitted in the name of a deity at one time or another. Sociopaths are not limited to the non-religious. How would you deal with religious sociopaths acting in the name of declared morality?

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

DC wrote:

> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:

>> Hi Dedric,

>>

>> Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a higher

>

>> power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason that

>

>> the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an atheist

>

>> knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I think

>

>> the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as

>> empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the very

>

>> broad sense. Now, how we got to

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 05:08:21 GMT

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

t;>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should

>> be

>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President

>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really

>> better

>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies

>>>>> disbelief

>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
for
>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in
any
>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>>
>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>>> doesn't
>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
>> forum
>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
to
>> take
>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is
to
>> give
>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
believe
>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>>> view.
>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in
>> a
>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
outlaw
>>>>> it.
>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>
>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
>> as a
>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
wins
>>>>> and
>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
>> in
>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>>>> balance
>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
>> very
>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>
>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>
>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
>> of
>>>>> work
>>>>> :-(....
>>>>>

>>>>> Regards,
>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>
>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
>> for
>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as
he
>> sees
>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>>>> (as
>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily
go
>>>>> down
>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>
>>>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)
>>>>> 59
>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>
>>> `
>>>Do we have any money to pay him? I don't think he's gonna work for free.

;oP

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
news:450e9b9e@linux...

> Find out if dude is interested in writing a windows Vista and OS-x driver

:)

>

> AA

>

>

> "DJ" <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)

> >

> >

> >

> >

>

> 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...

>

> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news, it's

> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others do

> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as well,

> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.

>

> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money and

> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It

> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared

> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have

> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.

>

> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How do
> you declare war on a tactic?
>
> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
>
> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get
> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>
> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing holy
> about war.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>
>
>
> DJ wrote:
> > I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda
just
> > came out with an ultimatum stating that it's full on war now and the
west
> > will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
Islam. So
> > where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
> >
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ee7ef@linux...
> >> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
own.
> >> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> -Jamie
> >> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> >>
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is
> > 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 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 would have been
an
> >>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
> >>>>
> >>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
> >>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
> >>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
> > while
> >>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
> >>>> actual way the solar system works.
> >>>>
> >>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
> >>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
about
> >>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
> >>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
> > and
> >>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
> >>>>
> >>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
> >>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
> > of
> >>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
who
> >>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.

> >>>>

> >>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big bucks

> >>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push to

> >>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our

> >>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes

> >>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.

> >>>>

> >>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to

> >>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in

> > spreading

> >>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.

> >>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the

> > focus

> >>>> on the use of force.

> >>>>

> >>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.

> > ;^)

> >>>> Have a great week!

> >>>>

> >>>> Cheers,

> >>>> -Jamie

> >>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

> >>>>

> >>>>

> >>>> DC wrote:

> >>>>> I thought this was worth reading 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

> >>>>> Regensberg, 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

> >>>>>

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

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

> >>>>>

> >>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> >>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> >>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>>
> >>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> >>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> >>>>

> >>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict X

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 06:00:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>>>>>

> >>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

> >>>>>
> >>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> >>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> >>>>>
> >>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

> >>>>>

> >>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
> >>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

> >>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

> >>>>>

> >>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
> >>>>> lost on them.

> >>>>

> >>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> >>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> >>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>>>

> >>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> >>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>>>

> >>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> >>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> >>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> >>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> >>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.

> >>>>

> >>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> >>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

> >>>> 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.
> >>>>

> >>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

> >>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
> >>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> >>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> >>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >>>>

> >>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

> >>>>

> >>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

> >>>>
> >>>> 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 globalization
> >>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> >>>> both are in decline.
> >>>>
> >>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> >>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> >>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> >>>>
> >>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> >>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

> >>>>
> >>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >
> >
> >Wow...

When I was recording Beyond 2000, in the 80's, (87 I think), we went to Bell Labs in New Jersey and they were just starting to work on a laser chip for computing...it was big...about the size of a dining room table, but they had it switching on and off....embryonic then.

Those guys there had dream jobs...PhD's, and all they had to do was dream, and think of "what is / what if...."

--

Martin Harrington
www.lendaneer-sound.com

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450ec8f5@linux...

>A Chip That Can Transfer Data Using Laser Light

>

> By JOHN MARKOFF

> Published: September 18, 2006

>

> SAN FRANCISCO, Sept. 17 - Researchers plan to announce on Monday that they

> have created a silicon-based chip that can produce laser beams. The

> advance

> will make it possible to use laser light rather than wires to send data

> between chips, removing the most significant bottleneck in computer
> design.
>
> The development is a result of research at Intel, the world's largest chip
> maker, and the University of California, Santa Barbara. Commercializing
> the
> new technology may not happen before the end of the decade, but the
> prospect
> of being able to place hundreds or thousands of data-carrying light beams
> on
> standard industry chips is certain to shake up both the communications and
> computer industries.
>
> Lasers are already used to transmit high volumes of computer data over
> longer distances - for example, between offices, cities and across
> oceans -
> using fiber optic cables. But in computer chips, data moves at great speed
> over the wires inside, then slows to a snail's pace when it is sent
> chip-to-chip inside a computer.
>
> With the barrier removed, computer designers will be able to rethink
> computers, packing chips more densely both in home systems and in giant
> data
> centers. Moreover, the laser-silicon chips - composed of a spider's web of
> laser light in addition to metal wires - portend a vastly more powerful
> and
> less expensive national computing infrastructure. For a few dollars
> apiece,
> such chips could transmit data at 100 times the speed of laser-based
> communications equipment, called optical transceivers, that typically cost
> several thousand dollars.
>
> Currently fiber optic networks are used to transmit data to individual
> neighborhoods in cities where the data is then distributed by slower
> conventional wire-based communications gear. The laser chips will make it
> possible to send avalanches of data to and from individual homes at far
> less
> cost.
>
> They could also give rise to a new class of supercomputers that could
> share
> data internally at speeds not possible today.
>
> The breakthrough was achieved by bonding a layer of light-emitting indium
> phosphide onto the surface of a standard silicon chip etched with special
> channels that act as light-wave guides. The resulting sandwich has the
> potential to create on a computer chip hundreds and possibly thousands of
> tiny, bright lasers that can be switched on and off billions of times a

> second.
>
> "This is a field that has just begun exploding in the past 18 months,"
> said
> Eli Yablonovitch, a physicist at the University of California, Los
> Angeles,
> a leading researcher in the field. "There is going to be a lot more
> optical
> communications in computing than people have thought."
>
> Indeed, the results of the development work, which will be reported in a
> coming issue of Optics Express, an international journal, indicate that a
> high-stakes race is under way worldwide. While the researchers at Intel
> and
> Santa Barbara are betting on indium phosphide, Japanese scientists in a
> related effort are pursuing a different material, the chemical element
> erbium.
>
> Although commercial chips with built-in lasers are years away, Luxtera, a
> company in Carlsbad, Calif., is already selling test chips that
> incorporate
> most optical components directly into silicon and then inject laser light
> from a separate source.
>
> The Intel-Santa Barbara work proves that it is possible to make complete
> photonic devices using standard chip-making machinery, although not
> entirely
> out of silicon. "There has always been this final hurdle," said Mario
> Paniccia, director of the Photonics Technology Lab at Intel. "We have now
> come up with a solution that optimizes both sides."
>
> In the past it has proved impossible to couple standard silicon with the
> exotic materials that emit light when electrically charged. But the
> university team supplied a low-temperature bonding technique that does not
> melt the silicon circuitry. The approach uses an electrically charged
> oxygen
> gas to create a layer of oxide just 25 atoms thick on each material. When
> heated and pressed together, the oxide layer fuses the two materials into
> a
> single chip that conducts information both through wires and on beams of
> reflected light.
>
> "Photonics has been a low-volume cottage industry," said John E. Bowers,
> director of the Multidisciplinary Optical Switching Technology Center at
> the
> University of California, Santa Barbara. "Everything will change and laser
> communications will be everywhere, including fiber to the home."
>

> Photonics industry experts briefed on the technique said that it would
> almost certainly pave the way for commercialization of the long-sought
> convergence of silicon chips and optical lasers. "Before, there was more
> hype than substance," said Alan Huang, a former Bell Laboratories
> researcher
> who is a pioneer in the field and is now chief technology officer of the
> Terabit Corporation, a photonics start-up company in Menlo Park, Calif.
> "Now
> I believe this will lead to future applications in optoelectronics
>
> If I don't have one of these by next week, I will die.....
>
> ;o)
>
>This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_001C_01C6DB52.C321A0C0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

DJ,
Have you had a chance to hear it yet?
Tom

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message =
news:450c945b@linux...
I installed it and the demo immediately timed out.

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
news:450c91a4\$1@linux...
> http://www.uaudio.com/email/UAD-1_v44.html
>
> AA
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> news:450c4079@linux...
> > I'm Ghosting my OS on my Cubase machine right now and then I'm =
gonna
have
> > to
> > install this.....dammit!!!
> >
> >
> > "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
> > news:450bda66\$1@linux...
> >> If you aren't already aware of this, UA just released version =
4.4.0
> > software

> >> for their famous 33609 compressor. Looks pretty neat.
 > >>
 > >>
 > >
 =
<http://webmail.pas.earthlink.net/wam/msg.jsp?msgid=3D14804&folder=3DEarth=Link+Se>
 > > rvices.spamBlocker.Suspect+Email&x=3D1578451007
 > >>
 > >> Rich
 > >>
 > >>
 > >
 > >
 >
 >

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?

<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

-----=_NextPart_000_001C_01C6DB52.C321A0C0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>DJ,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Have you had a chance to hear it =
yet?</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Tom</FONT></DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE=20
style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
  <DIV>"DJ" &lt;A=20
  =
href=3D"mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net">animix_spam-this-ahole=
_@animas.net</A>&gt;=20
  wrote in message <A=20
  href=3D"news:450c945b@linux">news:450c945b@linux</A>...</DIV>I =
```

installed it and=20
the demo immediately timed out.

"Aaron Allen" <<A=20
=
href=3D"mailto:know-spam@not_here.dude">know-spam@not_here.dude> =
wrote in=20
message
<A=20
href=3D"news:450c91a4\$1@linux">news:450c91a4\$1@linux...
> <A =
=
href=3D"http://www.uaudio.com/email/UAD-1_v44.html">http://www.uaudio.

Subject: Re: Oh g-wd . .
Posted by [DC](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 06:40:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

com=
/email/UAD-1_v44.html
>
>=20
AA
>
> "DJ" <<A=20
=
href=3D"mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net">animix_spam-this-ahole=
_@animas.net>=20
wrote in message
> <A=20
href=3D"news:450c4079@linux">news:450c4079@linux...
> > =
I'm=20
Ghosting my OS on my Cubase machine right now and then I'm=20
gonna
have
> > to
> > install=20
this.....dammit!!!
> >
> >
> > "Rich =
Lamanna"=20
<<A=20
=
href=3D"mailto:richard.lamanna@verizon.net">richard.lamanna@verizon.net</=
A>>=20
wrote in message
> > <A=20
href=3D"news:450bda66\$1@linux">news:450bda66\$1@linux...
> =
>> If=20
you aren't already aware of this, UA just released version =
4.4.0
> >=20
software
> >> for their famous 33609 compressor. Looks =
pretty=20
neat.
> >>
> >>
> >
<A=20
=
href=3D" http://webmail.pas.earthlink.net/wam/msg.jsp?msgid=3D14804&a mp; amp;fo=
lder=3DEarthLink+Se">http://webmail.pas.earthlink.net/wam/msg.jsp?msgid=3D=
14804& amp;folder=3DEarthLink+Se
>=20
> rvices.spamBlocker.Suspect+Email& amp;x=3D1578451007
>=20
>>
> >> Rich
> >>
> =
>>
>=20

>
>Tony,

I think you did pretty well, actually.

"Which God to follow" can be a sincere question, as in:
"it makes sense to me that God would have a plan for our lives and wants the best for us, and I need to know who God really is"

or it can be rhetoric, from a clear atheist position, as in:
"well, there's a god over here and there's a god over there, and another one in Boston, and how are we to know which god is the right one?"

and the person really believes in no God whatsoever.

The difference is important because if one believes in a creator, it is reasonable to assume that the creator is interested in him as well. This, at least is the Christian position, and the Bible and certainly the

life of Christ centers on the issue of "who cares about humans anyway?"

Well, John 3:16 answers that doesn't it, and while secularist reasoning can be shown to be utterly self-referential and even irrational, in the end spiritual things are spiritually discerned and if

someone simply wishes to dispute, they may do so, forever.

So, as a Christian, believing that Jesus came to save me, and that the Bible narrative, while not perfect in the details, nonetheless contains His story. I would say on that basis, that the God of the Bible is the right one, and I would say that the muslims are mistaken and do not serve God at all. "By their fruits you will know them"

However there is the obvious case of the righteous Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu etc. I do believe that the imprint of our creation exists in all of us, granting even the atheist a conscience, despite their basic antipathy to absolutes. Beyond that, I also believe that God turns no one away, so there is the mystery of those who seek God in their own culture and their own religion, clearly *finding* Him!

We are responsible for what we know, not what the other guy knows.

That doesn't make faiths all equal or the same.

BTW, the case can be made that ANY theistic belief is superior

to atheism and neo-darwinism, simply because it gives at least some basis for universal morality.

What about the righteous atheist? Well, there are a few of these, and I think some of them have been called by God to do good despite their ideology and that thing they follow that they call "conscience" is in reality the Holy Spirit and they may be saved on the basis of their reaction to that voice of God. I also think that denominations generally thoroughly *suck* (good theological term eh?) and have driven away many righteous people who live without religion in a righteous manner. I do believe they are all called to join the rest of us at some point, but I will not pretend to judge them, nor Hindus, Muslims etc on when that is.

Brain Welch (Head) from Korn became a Christian a while back, and evidently has a new tune called "Religion Must Die" and I think he has a point. Take a look at his new site. I like the music.

<http://www.headtochrist.com/>

Of course, whatever emerges from the death of religion, even if it is the most dynamic Christian community since the 1st century, will be called 'religion' by the secularists who so dominate our culture, so it's semantics to some extent.

DC

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:

>Hi Don,

>

>I'm not in the same league with you to debate theology. I'll try to state my

>feelings in the most coherent way, but it will be, at best, clumsy. The

>problem, from my point of view, with relying on "God" to dictate morality is

>that every different religion believes their God is the one true God (or

>God's in some cases). Evidently, fundamentalist Islam's God says it's

>completely moral and beyond that, an Islamic's duty to kill infidels. So,

>who's God's morals should all of mankind follow. You say yours. They say

>theirs. I can only follow what I believe to be true in my own heart. I feel

>that I can still have faith in something beyond myself (God) and faith that

>for what ever reason, I have the ability to sense right from wrong. Perhaps

>the one true God gave us that ability.? Obviously people do say "who cares"

>to the accepted social moral standards all the time. If not, we wouldn't

>have any murder, theft, rape, etc. But by and large, I think the majority of

>people know in their hearts the difference between right and wrong,

>regardless of what God they follow or weather they believe in God at all.

>

>Tony

>

>

>"DC" <dc@spammersinkabul.com> wrote in message news:450f0ab7\$1@linux...

>>

>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:

>>>Hi Dedric,

>>>

>>>Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a higher

>>

>>>power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason

>>>that

>>

>>>the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an atheist

>>

>>>knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I think

>>

>>>the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as

>>>empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the very

>>

>>>broad sense. Now, how we got to the point where we feel such a vast number

>>

>>>of emotions and are able to apply them to how we treat others is something

>>

>>>else to ponder.

>>>

>>>Tony

>>

>>

>> The problem, of course, is that without a belief in moral

>> absolutes, reflecting realites designed into us by our creator,

>> anyone can say "who cares" to any social construct, contract,

>> set of mutual obligations, or anthropological observation that

>> morals do indeed exist.
>>
>> In fact, one is invited to do so by an ideology that places
>> humankind, not God at the center of existence. When the self
>> is the center of the universe, one easily decides that someone
>> else's morals and ideas of a social contract are an illusion.
>> Worse, ideas about morals may even put them at a competitive
>> disadvantage compared to the person who has none. (welcome
>> to the music biz!)
>>
>> This result is likely given that set of assumptions, but it
>> becomes inevitable one you go down the road of the neo-darwinists
>> and socio-biologists who assert that humanity is simply a
>> vehicle for furthering our "selfish genes" rather than a created
>> being made to live in community with God and each other.
>>
>> The theist (and certainly the Christian) must always live in
>> submission to a greater power, never being the center of
>> existence, and deriving morality from a higher power than the
>> self. Humility is our greatest calling, one I fail at
>> regularly, but still, it is there.
>>
>> Without God, all is permitted.
>>
>> DC
>>
>> "It appears that the great sacred-cow of our culture, the self,
>> is not automatically interesting".
>>
>> -Robert Hughes
>>
>>
>
>Anyone, anyone? Beuller?

So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in today's

I assume we all think that schools in the Middle East where children are indoctrinated with anti-western ideas mixed with big dose of religious zeal

Gene"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:

>
>

>

>
>I assume we all think that schools in the Middle East where children are
>indoctrinated with anti-western ideas mixed with big dose of religious zeal

>
>Gene
>

Right.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=co1_9IR9EpMDunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...

>
> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?
>
> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in
> today's
> world?Deej, good lord amighty, if we go around blowing away every perceived threat to us, we're gonna be dropping a lot of bombs on a lot of people. Where should we start? Seriously? How many countries shall we bomb back to the stone age in an attempt to rid the world of potential threats? How many civil wars shall we create and get bogged down in to appease our more war-like citizens? Cuz last time I checked, there were easily half 3 or 4 dangerous states posing a much greater economic and/or military threat to us and our allies than Iraq recently did.

And speaking of Iraq, how the hell are we ever gonna spare the man-power to fight other countries while we are so severely over-taxed in Iraq? Is it any accident that Iran has been so loud and obnoxious recently? They know we are compromised tactically. They laugh loud and long every day at our current difficulties.

Any of you guys ever bone up on the last 60 years or so of Arabic/Persian history? We've been playing with fire for a long time now, as far as I can tell. Seems to me that part of the current problem is that a lot of skeletons in our national closet are coming to light. I certainly don't condone the radical Islamic fringe that seems to have it in for us, but folks in the Mideast in general have a few good reasons to profoundly resent our beloved U.S.A. Would I like to erase the earth of all religious and political fundamentalism? Hell yes. I'd also like us to get really, really, serious about not meddling in the affairs of other people in a decades-long effort to influence the price of oil.

Jimmy

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450f1b1d@linux...

> 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:450f0

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [rick](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 10:11:11 GMT

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

hristian churches

who,

> > >>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
evidence

> > > of

> > >>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
> who

> > >>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.

> > >>>

> > >>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
> bucks

> > >>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push
> to

> > >>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
our

> > >>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
sometimes

> > >>> hide behind Christianity to do so.

> > >>>

> > >>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
to

> > >>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in

> > > spreading

> > >>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
power.

> > >>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
> > > focus

> > >>> on the use of force.

> > >>>

> > >>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
victory.

> > > ;^)

> > >>> Have a great week!

> > >>>

> > >>> Cheers,
> > >>> -Jamie
> > >>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>> DC wrote:
> > >>>> I thought this was worth reading 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.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the
> > >>>> Pope apologize. Benedict's speech is a work of enlightened
> > >>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> > >>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> > >>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> > >>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> > >>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> > >>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel
> > >>>> II: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there
> > >>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command
> > >>>> to spread by the sword the faith he preached."
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Four days later, according to AP: "Pakistan's legislature
> > >>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> > >>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> > >>>> likened the pontiff 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. 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 saying

> > >>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> > >>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against
> > >>>> Christianity-and they explicitly endorse and join this jihad.
> > >>>> The Times is saying to Islamists, 'we can join your 'spiritual'
> > >>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> The Times editors are living in a fool's paradise. The
> > >>>> "spiritual" non-violent jihad of propaganda is merely the flip
> > >>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> > >>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> > >>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> > >>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> > >>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> > >>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> > >>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:
> > >>>> "He needs to offer a deep and persuasive apology." 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
> > >>>> 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 modern 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 globalization
> > >>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
> > >>>> both are in decline.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist
> > >>>> will meet in combat, just as Hitler's fascists broke their pact
> > >>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
> > >>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to
> > >>>> reply to the Pope's key point, borrowed from the Byzantine
> > >>>> Emperor: "'Not to act reasonably, not to act with logos (word or
> > >>>> reason) is contrary to the nature of God,'.. It is to this great
> > >>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in
> &g

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [rick](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 10:16:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t; >>>>> the dialogue of cultures."
> > >>>>
> > >>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
> > >>>>
> > >>>
> > >
> > >
>
>"Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:450f2afe@linux...
> DeeJ, good lord amighty, if we go around blowing away every perceived
> threat
> to us, we're gonna be dropping a lot of bombs on a lot of people. Where
> should we start? Seriously? How many countries shall we bomb back to the
> stone age in an attempt to rid the world of potential threats? How many
> civil wars shall we create and get bogged down in to appease our more
> war-like citizens?

Only the ones Bush promotes on Fox News.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.

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 13:05:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:
>>Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.
>>
>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?
>>>
>>> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in

>>> today's
>>> world?
>>
>>
>Hey Chris,
Good to hear from you!
Thanks for the info.
Take care,
MR

"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 Tracktion 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 fore backs ups 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 24/48 at 3 ms buffer on the RME Fireface 400. If you raise
> the buffer then 48 tracks should be no problem.
>
>
> She generally won't be
> > recording more than two tracks at a time, four absolute max. I don't
think
> > she'd be mixing more than eight tracks at any one time either. I will
> > certainly be surfing myself to see what's out there, but I'd take you
folk's
> > recommendations, even over say... Mr. Spock's --although he did some
pretty
> > nifty stuff analyzing those whale sounds.
> > Thank you, thank you.
> > MR
> >
> >
>
> The current laptops well use the new Core 2 Duo CPUs.
>
http://www.adkproaudio.com/systems/saved_system.cfm?systemid=103&saved_id=8935
>
> :)
>
> Chris
>
>
> --
> Chris Ludwig
>
> ADK Pro Audio

> (859) 635-5762
> www.adkproaudio.com
> chrisl@adkproaudio.com I think this one is just as much fun:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CCODlhAXbQM&NR>

.....and these are pretty cool, dont'cha think?
<http://www.armorofgodpjs.com/>

Yep....there are whack jobs everywhere out there. I wonder how much of this stuff is backlash from the broadcasts we've been seeing for years of the automations produced by the madrasas

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote in message [news:450f256f\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:450f256f$1@linux...)
>
> "gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> >Sorry - I can't help myself.
> >
> >
> >I assume we all think that schools in the Middle East where children are
> >indoctrinated with anti-western ideas mixed with big dose of religious
zeal
> >and combined with preaching the virtues of martyrdom are a bad thing.
right?
> >
> >Gene
> >
>
> Right.
>
> http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=co1_9IR9EpMI wasn't that impressed with Kissinger.
However I heard our former
Colorado Senator and current head of the UN Foundation talk this spring,
and was impressed with what he had to say. Tim Wirth. Actively involved.

Or perhaps another former Colorado Senator, former president of the University of Northern Colorado, now president of the University of Colorado, Hank Brown. He has done some local diplomacy in this state and seems to know how to calm people down.

Cheers,
-Jamie
<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

John wrote:

> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?

>

> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in today's
> world? I think I answered your question as much as I can by stating that a diplomat
cannot do anything unless there is willingness to participate in a
meaningful and sincere dialog.....so keeping in mind that a negotiator must
have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some sort of
track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be a
credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f310e\$1@linux...

>

> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's world?

>

>

> "justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:

> > Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.

> >

> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...

> > >

> > > Anyone, anyone? Beuller?

> > >

> > > So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in

> > > today's

> > > world?

> >

> >

> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature of
the threat.

We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
before the 9/11 attack.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terrorism

We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
preemptive attack policy. :^)

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...
>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news, it's
>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others do
>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as well,
>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>
>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money and
>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have
>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>
>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How do
>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>
>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
>>
>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get
>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>
>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing holy
>> about war.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda
> just
>>> came out with an ultimatum stating that it's full on war now and the
> west
>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
> Islam. So
>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>>>
>>>

>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
> own.
>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line is
>>> 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 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 would have been
> an
>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung on
>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
>>> while

>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>>
>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
> about
>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and clever
>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries ago,
>>> and
>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>>>>
>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches who,
>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting evidence
>>> of
>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
> who
>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>>
>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
> bucks
>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push
> to
>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing, our
>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who sometimes
>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>>
>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways to
>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
>>> spreading
>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in power.
>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
>>> focus
>>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>>
>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.
>>> ;^)
>>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading if any of you are interested.
>>>>>>

I

>>>>>> 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

>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>>>>>>

>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>>>>

>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> 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

>>>>>> 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

>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>>

>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>>>>

>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not

>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>>>>>>

>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is

>>>>>> lost on them.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a

>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in

>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists

>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand

>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

>>>>>> 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.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>>>>>>

>>>>>> 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 globalization
>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>>>>>> both are in decline.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.

>>>>>>

>>>

>

>There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just as clearly it's important for religion.

As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that. I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing something for some other reason, of course.

If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a problem with that.

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

TCB wrote:

> Here's dictionary.com

>

> [faith](#); /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[feyth]

> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

- > 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's ability.
- > 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis would be substantiated by fact.
- > 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the firm faith of the Pilgrims.
- > 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.: to be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
- > 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish faith.
- > 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise, engagement, etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
- > 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath, allegiance, etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent troubles.
- > 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made through Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
- >
- > I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can do

> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but do
> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have faith but
> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>
> TCB
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>
>>
>> TCB wrote:
>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals take
>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have faith.
>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.
>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>>
>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find its
>
>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>
>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>
>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>
>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>
>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people would
>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>
>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains, fly
>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>
>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>
>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>
>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>

>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree about
>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>
>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>
>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying the
>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are not
>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>
>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that
> is
>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right
> to
>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such
> as
>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>
>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>
>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common sense
>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>
>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>
>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>
>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>
>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>
>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based
> on
>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>
>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>
>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>
>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and

>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to go
>
>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>
>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there are
>>> tons
>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
>>> tells
>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
>>> of
>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>
>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
>>> what
>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to
> decide
>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>
>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with
>>> no
>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>
>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>
>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has a
> proven
>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
>>> or
>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>
>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
> anger
>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

person

>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the whole.

>>>>

>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,

>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can

> be

>>> means

>>>> of survival.

>>>>

>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences

>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies

>>> even

>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any form

>>> of

>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,

>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.

>>>>

>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't

>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make

>>> the

>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only

> be

>>> an

>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time,

> and

>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person to

> person,

>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either

>>> be

>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because

>>> their

>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't

> have

>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.

>>>>

>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were no

>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?

>>>>

>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of

> either,

>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence

>>> - it

>>>> would just be another event in time.

>>>>

>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both in

> whether

>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
 >>> moral
 >>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
 >>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
 >>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even when
 >>> we
 >>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
 >>> to
 >>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no power
 >>> in
 >>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and loving
 >>> God
 >>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in the
 >>> way
 >>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
 >>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
 >>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
 >>> and 2)
 >>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump greed
 >>> and
 >>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Regards,
 >>>>> Dedric
 >>>>>
 >>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
 >>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
 >>>>>
 >>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
 >>> morals
 >>>>>> is absurd, I think.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Jimmy
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
 >>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
 >>>>>>> Gene -
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
 > pretty
 >>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and even
 >>> the
 >>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence
 > and
 >>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest

>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>>> car
>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured
> and
>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the Pope
>>> quote
>>>>>> a
>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
> religion
>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>> might
>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in many
>>> of
>>>>>> the
>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked
> to,
>>> and
>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>> world
>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>>>> People
>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>> their
>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
>>> of
>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our own
>>>>>> country
>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this kind
>>> of
>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct thing
>>> to
>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and
> hence
>>>>>> any
>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice to
> believe
>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of Allah
>>> the
>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments
> in
>>> 24
>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is a

> sad,
>>>>> and
>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear
> -
>>> it's
>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal whims
>>> that
>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
>>> also
>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God and
>>> is
>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope
> as
>>> a
>>>>>> sense
>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong, then
>>> at
>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
>>> be
>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the President
>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>> better
>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
> for
>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief in
> any
>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for others?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on this
>>> forum
>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
> to
>>> take
>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal is
> to
>>> give
>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
> believe
>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>>>> view.
>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public in
>>> a

>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
> outlaw
>>>>>> it.
>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
>>> as a
>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
> wins
>>>>>> and
>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
>>> in
>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain the
>>>>>> balance
>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in the
>>> very
>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
>>> of
>>>>>> work
>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
>>> for
>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as
> he
>>> sees

>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that he
>>>>> depicts
>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of trouble
>>>>> (as
>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily
> go
>>>>> down
>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>
>>>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)
>>>>> 59
>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>
>>>> `
>Fiber networks rock. I'm wondering though, when will this all hit a phase
where a guy has to get a variance just to run his network :)

AA

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450ec8f5@linux...

>A Chip That Can Transfer Data Using Laser Light

>

> By JOHN MARKOFF

> Published: September 18, 2006

>

> SAN FRANCISCO, Sept. 17 - Researchers plan to announce on Monday that they

> have created a silicon-based chip that can produce laser beams. The

> advance

> will make it possible to use laser light rather than wires to send data

> between chips, removing the most significant bottleneck in computer

> design.

>

> The development is a result of research at Intel, the world's largest chip

> maker, and the University of California, Santa Barbara. Commercializing

> the

> new technology may not happen before the end of the decade, but the
> prospect
> of being able to place hundreds or thousands of data-carrying light beams
> on
> standard industry chips is certain to shake up both the communications and
> computer industries.
>
> Lasers are already used to transmit high volumes of computer data over
> longer distances - for example, between offices, cities and across
> oceans -
> using fiber optic cables. But in computer chips, data moves at great speed
> over the wires inside, then slows to a snail's pace when it is sent
> chip-to-chip inside a computer.
>
> With the barrier removed, computer designers will be able to rethink
> computers, packing chips more densely both in home systems and in giant
> data
> centers. Moreover, the laser-silicon chips - composed of a spider's web of
> laser light in addition to metal wires - portend a vastly more powerful
> and
> less expensive national computing infrastructure. For a few dollars
> apiece,
> such chips could transmit data at 100 times the speed of laser-based
> communications equipment, called optical transceivers, that typically cost
> several thousand dollars.
>
> Currently fiber optic networks are used to transmit data to individual
> neighborhoods in cities where the data is then distributed by slower
> conventional wire-based communications gear. The laser chips will make it
> possible to send avalanches of data to and from individual homes at far
> less
> cost.
>
> They could also give rise to a new class of supercomputers that could
> share
> data internally at speeds not possible today.
>
> The breakthrough was achieved by bonding a layer of light-emitting indium
> phosphide onto the surface of a standard silicon chip etched with special
> channels that act as light-wave guides. The resulting sandwich has the
> potential to create on a computer chip hundreds and possibly thousands of
> tiny, bright lasers that can be switched on and off billions of times a
> second.
>
> "This is a field that has just begun exploding in the past 18 months,"
> said
> Eli Yablonovitch, a physicist at the University of California, Los
> Angeles,

> a leading researcher in the field. "There is going to be a lot more
> optical
> communications in computing than people have thought."
>
> Indeed, the results of the development work, which will be reported in a
> coming issue of Optics Express, an international journal, indicate that a
> high-stakes race is under way worldwide. While the researchers at Intel
> and
> Santa Barbara are betting on indium phosphide, Japanese scientists in a
> related effort are pursuing a different material, the chemical element
> erbium.
>
> Although commercial chips with built-in lasers are years away, Luxtera, a
> company in Carlsbad, Calif., is already selling test chips that
> incorporate
> most optical components directly into silicon and then inject laser light
> from a separate source.
>
> The Intel-Santa Barbara work proves that it is possible to make complete
> photonic devices using standard chip-making machinery, although not
> entirely
> out of silicon. "There has always been this final hurdle," said Mario
> Paniccia, director of the Photonics Technology Lab at Intel. "We have now
> come up with a solution that optimizes both sides."
>
> In the past it has proved impossible to couple standard silicon with the
> exotic materials that emit light when electrically charged. But the
> university team supplied a low-temperature bonding technique that does not
> melt the silicon circuitry. The approach uses an electrically charged
> oxygen
> gas to create a layer of oxide just 25 atoms thick on each material. When
> heated and pressed together, the oxide layer fuses the two materials into
> a
> single chip that conducts information both through wires and on beams of
> reflected light.
>
> "Photonics has been a low-volume cottage industry," said John E. Bowers,
> director of the Multidisciplinary Optical Switching Technology Center at
> the
> University of California, Santa Barbara. "Everything will change and laser
> communications will be everywhere, including fiber to the home."
>
> Photonics industry experts briefed on the technique said that it would
> almost certainly pave the way for commercialization of the long-sought
> convergence of silicon chips and optical lasers. "Before, there was more
> hype than substance," said Alan Huang, a former Bell Laboratories
> researcher
> who is a pioneer in the field and is now chief technology officer of the

> Terabit Corporation, a photonics start-up company in Menlo Park, Calif.
> "Now
> I believe this will lead to future applications in optoelectronics
>
> If I don't have one of these by next week, I will die.....
>
> ;o)
>
> Dude, that is so in line with my thoughts on organized religion that you
might be a long lost brother. As a kid I spent a lot of time in a small town
church where I was told that God was, essentially, a must-fear mean old man
type. I haven't spent a lot of time near that particular sect since I was
able to 'not' be around it. I'm not too sure about all these 'we welcome all
thinking and religion as ok' types either. There's got to be some kind of
middle ground theology out there, I just haven't found it yet.

AA

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:450f2278\$1@linux...
>
> Tony,
>
> I think you did pretty well, actually.
>
> "Which God to follow" can be a sincere question, as in:
> "it makes sense to me that God would have a plan for our lives and
> wants the best for us, and I need to know who God really is"
>
> or it can be rhetoric, from a clear atheist position, as in:
> "well, there's a god over here and there's a god over there, and
> another one in Boston, and how are we to know which god is the
> right one?"
>
> and the person really believes in no God whatsoever.
>
> The difference is important because if one believes in a creator,

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 14:49:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

it is
> reasonable to assume that the creator is interested in him as well.
> This, at least is the Christian position, and the Bible and certainly the
>
> life of Christ centers on the issue of "who cares about humans
> anyway?"

>
> Well, John 3:16 answers that doesn't it, and while secularist
> reasoning can be shown to be utterly self-referential and even
> irrational, in the end spiritual things are spiritually discerned and if
>
> someone simply wishes to dispute, they may do so, forever.
>
> So, as a Christian, believing that Jesus came to save me, and that
> the Bible narrative, while not perfect in the details, nonetheless
> contains His story. I would say on that basis, that the God of the
> Bible is the right one, and I would say that the muslims are mistaken
> and do not serve God at all. "By their fruits you will know them"
>
> *However* there is the obvious case of the righteous Muslim,
> Buddhist, Hindu etc. I do believe that the imprint of our creation
> exists in all of us, granting even the atheist a conscience, despite
> their basic antipathy to absolutes. Beyond that, I also believe that
> God turns no one away, so there is the mystery of those who
> seek God in their own culture and their own religion, clearly *finding*
> Him!
>
>
> We are responsible for what we know, not what the other guy knows.
>
> That doesn't make faiths all equal or the same.
>
> BTW, the case can be made that ANY theistic belief is superior
> to atheism and neo-darwinism, simply because it gives at least some
> basis for universal morality.
>
> What about the righteous atheist? Well, there are a few of these,
> and I think some of them have been called by God to do good despite their
> ideology and that thing they follow that they call
> "conscience" is in reality the Holy Spirit and they may be saved
> on the basis of their reaction to that voice of God. I also think that
> denominations generally thoroughly *suck* (good theological
> term eh?) and have driven away many righteous people who live
> without religion in a righteous manner. I do believe they are all
> called to join the rest of us at some point, but I will not pretend
> to judge them, nor Hindus, Muslims etc on when that is.
>
> Brain Welch (Head) from Korn became a Christian a while back, and
> evidently has a new tune called "Religion Must Die" and I think he
> has a point. Take a look at his new site. I like the music.
>
> <http://www.headtochrist.com/>
>
> Of course, whatever emerges from the death of religion, even if it

> is the most dynamic Christian community since the 1st century,
> will be called 'religion' by the secularists who so dominate our
> culture, so it's semantics to some extent.
>
> DC
>
>
>
>
>
> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>Hi Don,
>>
>>I'm not in the same league with you to debate theology. I'll try to state
> my
>>feelings in the most coherent way, but it will be, at best, clumsy. The
>
>>problem, from my point of view, with relying on "God" to dictate morality
> is
>>that every different religion believes their God is the one true God (or
>
>>God's in some cases). Evidently, fundamentalist Islam's God says it's
>>completely moral and beyond that, an Islamic's duty to kill infidels. So,
>
>>who's God's morals should all of mankind follow. You say yours. They say
>
>>theirs. I can only follow what I believe to be true in my own heart. I
>>feel
>
>>that I can still have faith in something beyond myself (God) and faith
>>that
>
>>for what ever reason, I have the ability to sense right from wrong.
>>Perhaps
>
>>the one true God gave us that ability.? Obviously people do say "who
>>cares"
>
>>to the accepted social moral standards all the time. If not, we wouldn't
>
>>have any murder, theft, rape, etc. But by and large, I think the majority
> of
>>people know in their hearts the difference between right and wrong,
>>regardless of what God they follow or weather they believe in God at all.
>>
>>Tony
>>
>>
>>"DC" <dc@spammersinkabul.com> wrote in message news:450f0ab7\$1@linux...

>>>
>>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>>>Hi Dedric,
>>>>
>>>>Don't take my comments as an indication that I have no "faith" in a
>>>>higher
>>>
>>>>power, but couldn't our ability to feel empathy be one possible reason
>
>>>>that
>>>
>>>>the majority of people might have similar morals. I don't think an
>>>>atheist
>>>
>>>>knows murder is wrong just because god said "thou shalt not kill". I
>>>>think
>>>
>>>>the golden rule has a lot to do with it. Over time, we have learned as
>>>>empathetic beings what is ultimately right and wrong. At least in the
> very
>>>
>>>>broad sense. Now, how we got to the point where we feel such a vast
>>>>number
>>>
>>>>of emotions and are able to apply them to how we treat others is
>>>>something
>>>
>>>>else to ponder.
>>>>
>>>>Tony
>>>
>>>
>>> The problem, of course, is that without a belief in moral
>>> absolutes, reflecting realites designed into us by our creator,
>>> anyone can say "who cares" to any social construct, contract,
>>> set of mutual obligations, or anthropological observation that
>>> morals do indeed exist.
>>>
>>> In fact, one is invited to do so by an ideology that places
>>> humankind, not God at the center of existence. When the self
>>> is the center of the universe, one easily decides that someone
>>> else's morals and ideas of a social contract are an illusion.
>>> Worse, ideas about morals may even put them at a competitive
>>> disadvantage compared to the person who has none. (welcome
>>> to the music biz!)
>>>
>>> This result is likely given that set of assumptions, but it
>>> becomes inevitable one you go down the road of the neo-darwinists

>>> and socio-biologists who assert than humanity is simply a
>>> vehicle for furthering our "selfish genes" rather than a created
>>> being made to live in community with God and each other.

>>>

>>> The theist (and certainly the Christian) must always live in
>>> submission to a greater power, never being the center of
>>> existence, and deriving morality from a higher power than the
>>> self. Humility is our greatest calling, one I fail at
>>> regularly, but still, it is there.

>>>

>>> Without God, all is permitted.

>>>

>>> DC

>>>

>>> "It appears that the great sacred-cow of our culture, the self,
>>> is not automatically interesting".

>>>

>>> -Robert Hughes

>>>

>>>

>>

>>

>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> 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 '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. She generally won't be

>recording more than two tracks at a time, four absolute max. I don't think

>she'd be mixing more than eight tracks at any one time either. I will

>certainly be surfing myself to see what's out there, but I'd take you folk's

>recommendations, even over say... Mr. Spock's --although he did some pretty

>nifty stuff analyzing those whale sounds.

>Thank you, thank you.

>MR

>

>

I would go with a MacBook Pro and run Cubase under XP/ Bootcamp for the next
few months. The UB version should be out soon. For just a few tracks the

This is an extremely fast box, and with an external drive you can do serious
recording, editing and mixing on it.

For simple needs, I would suggest an M-Audio Firewire interface. Low cost,
good drivers, works Mac and PC fine and she can even go to Pro Tools M-Powered
later if she likes. (Did I say that?)

GeneWhat 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 Tracktion 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 fore backs ups 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 24/48 at 3 ms buffer on the RME Fireface 400. If you raise

> the buffer then 48 tracks should be no problem.

>

>

> She generally won't be

> > recording more than two tracks at a time, four absolute max. I don't
think

> > she'd be mixing more than eight tracks at any one time either. I will

> > certainly be surfing myself to see what's out there, but I'd take you
folk's

> > recommendations, even over say... Mr. Spock's --although he did some pretty
> > nifty stuff analyzing those whale sounds.
> > Thank you, thank you.
> > MR
> >
> >
>
> The current laptops well use the new Core 2 Duo CPUs.
>
> 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"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:
>
>
>DJ,
>Have you had a chance to hear it yet?
>Tom

Not DJ but...

I had it for a few hours before my temp license timed out prematurely. Sounds nice and fairly close to the real thing. I did a short comparison to my Portico5043. The UAD has a similar flavor and controls the dynamics in a very similar way, but it is missing the creamy sound of the hardware - And I hate people

I will get it. I might as well render the real thing.
GeneHa! Having been a local downtown business owner, that ain't funny, actually.

Jimmy

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
[news:450f401a\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:450f401a$1@linux...)
> Fiber networks rock. I'm wondering though, when will this all hit a phase

> where a guy has to get a variance just to run his network :)

>

> AA

>I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would be silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point. Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX' it's just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith. Probably the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's sort of about this very topic.

http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29_81628?ie=UTF8&s=books

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>

>There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just as

>clearly it's important for religion.

>

>As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that.

>I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing something

>for some other reason, of course.

>

>If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a problem with that.

>

>Cheers,

> -Jamie

> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

>

>

>TCB wrote:

>> Here's dictionary.com

>>

>> faith  /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[feyth]

>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's ability.

>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis would

>> be substantiated by fact.

>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the firm

faith

>> of the Pilgrims.

>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.:
to

>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.

>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish faith.

>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise, engagement,
>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.

>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,
allegiance,

>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent troubles.

>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made through
>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.

>>

>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can
do

>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but
do

>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have faith
but

>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.

>>

>> TCB

>>

>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.

>>>

>>> Cheers,

>>> -Jamie

>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

>>>

>>>

>>> TCB wrote:

>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals
take

>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have
faith.

>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.

>>

>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious

>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."

>>>>>

>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find
its

>>

>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the

>>

>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>>
>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>>
>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>
>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people
would
>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>>
>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains,
fly
>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>
>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have

>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more

>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>>
>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>>
>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>>
>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree
about
>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a

>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>
>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>>
>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE

>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying
the
>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are
not
>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>
>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that
>> is
>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right
>> to
>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such

>> as
>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>>
>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>
>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common
sense
>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>>
>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>
>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>
>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>>
>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>>
>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based
>> on
>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>
>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>>
>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>>
>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and

>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to
go
>>
>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>
>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there
are
>>>> tons
>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself

>>>> tells
>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
>>>> of
>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>
>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
>>>> what
>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to
>> decide
>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>
>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with
>>>> no
>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>
>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>
>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has
>> a
>> proven
>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
>>>> or
>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>
>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
>> anger
>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
>> person
>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the
whole.
>>>>>
>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can
>> be
>>>> means
>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>
>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
>>>>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 15:14:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
 >>>> even
 >>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any
 form
 >>>> of
 >>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
 >>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
 >>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
 >>>> the
 >>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only
 >> be
 >>>> an
 >>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time,
 >> and
 >>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
 to
 >> person,
 >>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
 >>>> be
 >>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
 >>>> their
 >>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't
 >> have
 >>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
 no
 >>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
 >>>>>
 >>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
 >> either,
 >>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
 >>>> - it
 >>>>> would just be another event in time.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
 in
 >> whether
 >>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
 >>>> moral
 >>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
 >>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
 >>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
 when
 >>>> we
 >>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option

>>>> to
 >>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no
 power
 >>>> in
 >>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
 loving
 >>>> God
 >>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in
 the
 >>>> way
 >>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
 >>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
 >>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
 >>>> and 2)
 >>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
 greed
 >>>> and
 >>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
 >>>>>
 >>>>> Regards,
 >>>>> Dedric
 >>>>>
 >>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
 >>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
 >>>>>
 >>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
 >>>> morals
 >>>>>> is absurd, I think.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Jimmy
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
 >>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
 >>>>>>> Gene -
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
 >> pretty
 >>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
 even
 >>>> the
 >>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence
 >> and
 >>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
 >>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
 >>>> car

>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured
>> and
>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
Pope
>>>> quote
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>> religion
>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>>> might
>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in
many
>>>> of
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked
>> to,
>>>> and
>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>>> world
>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>>> their
>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
>>>> of
>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
own
>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
kind
>>>> of
>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
thing
>>>> to
>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and
>> hence
>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice
to
>> believe
>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of
Allah

>>>> the
>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments
>> in
>>>> 24
>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is
a
>> sad,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear
>> -
>>>> it's
>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
whims
>>>> that
>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
>>>> also
>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God
and
>>>> is
>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope
>> as
>>>> a
>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
then
>>>> at
>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
>>>> be
>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
President
>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>>> better
>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
>> for
>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
in
>> any
>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
others?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam
>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
this

>>>> forum
 >>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
 >> to
 >>>> take
 >>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
 is
 >> to
 >>>> give
 >>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
 >> believe
 >>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
 >>>>>>> view.
 >>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public
 in
 >>>> a
 >>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
 >> outlaw
 >>>>>>> it.
 >>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
 >>>> as a
 >>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
 >> wins
 >>>>>>> and
 >>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
 >>>> in
 >>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
 the
 >>>>>>> balance
 >>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
 the
 >>>> very
 >>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
 >>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
 >>>> of
 >>>>>>> work
 >>>>>>> :-(....
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Regards,
 >>>>>>> Dedric
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
 >>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
 >>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...
 >>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
 >>>>>>> administration
 >>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
 >>>> for
 >>>>>>> perusing
 >>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Religion.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
 >>>>>>> Awakening"
 >>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as
 >> he
 >>>> sees
 >>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
 >>>>>>> terrorists
 >>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that
 he
 >>>>>>> depicts
 >>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
 >>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of
 trouble
 >>>>>>> (as
 >>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily
 >> go
 >>>>>>> down
 >>>>>>> hill from here.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)
 >>>>>>> 59
 >>>>>>> 4_pf.html
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Gene
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>> `
 >>Dimitrios,

Were these tested for noise and microphonic distortion prior to you
 purchasing them?

Do you offer any guarantee?
If so...please reserve them for me until next week.
Thanks!!
--
Brandon

"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:

>Dimitrios,

>

>Were these tested for noise and microphonic distortion prior to you
>purchasing them?

>Do you offer any guarantee?

>If so...please reserve them for me until next week.

>Thanks!!

>--

>Brandon

>

>

>

>"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote in message news:4507989b\$1@linux...

>>

>> Hello Brandon,

>> Yes there are many fakes out there.

>> I happen to have some NOS Telefunken (original not fake :) so I might
sell

>> a couple.

>> I am asking 100 \$ for both.

>> This is a very good price for NOS ones.

>> The only negative is that there are not in original boxes.

>> They were bought on a bulk but they are definitely NOS.

>> Regards,

>> Dimitrios

>>

>> "Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:

>> >Thanks, I was looking here.

>> ><http://www.audiotubes.com/12au7.htm>

>> >Heard of em'?

>> >

>> >

>> >--

>> >Brandon Goodwin

>> >

>> >Process Engineering

>> >Pentech Assembly

>> >"DC" <DC@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:45070dd5\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> Be aware that these will be expensive. Also, be careful who
>> >> you buy from, since there are lots of fake Telefunken's out there.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> Dougs has some used ones:
>> >>
>> >> <http://www.dougstubes.com/12au7.htm>
>> >>
>> >> I haven't bought from these guys, but they list them (do a page
>> >> search for telefunken)
>> >> <http://pages.prodigy.net/jimmcshane/tubes.htm>
>> >>
>> >> This guy has 'em (again, do a page search)
>> >> <http://www.vacuumtube.com/guitar.htm>
>> >>
>> >> I would also email Mike at KCA and let him know you are looking
>> >> and he will come up with them at one point or another.
>> >>
>> >> <http://kcanostubes.com/content/>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> They are available on ebay, but be VERY careful who you buy from!
>> >>
>> >> Good luck.
>> >>
>> >> DC
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> "Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote:
>> >> >So I am just supposed to get Telefunken brand ECC82s?
>> >> >
>> >> >Would the ECC802 be better?
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >ECC82: This is the European version of the 12AU7, and is identical
>> to
>> it.
>> >> >The brands in demand are Telefunken, Amperex, and Mullard. Telefunken
>> >tubes
>> >> have a diamond shape molded into the bottom of the glass. Both ribbed
>> >plate
>> >> >and the more famous smoothplate types are available, just like the
>> >12AX7,
>> >> >but are being hunted down and soon may be an endangered species.

>Amperex
>> >> and
>> >> >Mullard have tiny date codes etched in the glass near the bottom of
>the
>> >> >tube. The most popular Amperex are the Holland made Bugle Boy series,
>> >with
>> >> >the tiny cartoon tube blowing a bugle on the label. They later went
>to
>> >just
>> >> >a white label that said "Amperex", and then after that used the orange
>> >label
>> >> >with the world logo. The earlier Mullard tubes had the word "Mullard"
>> >inside
>> >> >of a shield logo, later versions said "IEC Mullard". These are all
>tubes
>> >> of
>> >> >unequalled quality, and are worth the high prices they are commanding
>> >these
>> >> >days. Even used ones will blow away any of the trashy tubes in
>production
>> >> >today. Vintage versions again used the chalky paint, and frequently
>the
>> >> >labels on any of these tubes are usually smeared.
>> >> >
>> >> >ECC802: This is a premium version of the European ECC82, with matched
>> >triode
>> >> >sections. These are very rare in the USA, and often command very high
>> >> >prices.
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >--
>> >> >Brandon Goodwin
>> >> >
>> >> >Process Engineering
>> >> >Pentech Assembly
>> >> >"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote in message news:

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 15:58:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

; >> >> > >
>> >> >> > > Hope this helps
>> >> >> > > Regards,
>> >> >> > > Dimitrios
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >

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

>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.

Without risk management there would be no insurance.

Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a lasting and beneficial peace.

Cheers,
-Jamie
<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

TCB wrote:

> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would be
> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point.
> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXXX' it's
> just not true and XXXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith. Probably
> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's sort
> of about this very topic.
>
> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29_81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>
> TCB
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just as
>
>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>
>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some
>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that.
>
>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing something
>
>> for some other reason, of course.

>>

>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the
>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>> problem with that.

>>

>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

>>

>>

>> TCB wrote:

>>> Here's dictionary.com

>>>

>>> [faith](#); /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[feyth]
>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's ability.

>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis
> would
>>> be substantiated by fact.

>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the firm
> faith
>>> of the Pilgrims.

>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.:
> to
>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.

>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish faith.

>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise, engagement,
>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.

>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,
> allegiance,
>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent troubles.

>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made through
>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.

>>>

>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can
> do
>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but
> do
>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have faith
> but
>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.

>>>

>>> TCB

>>>

>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.

>>>>

>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals
> take
>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have
> faith.
>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married, etc.
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>>>>
>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find
> its
>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to the
>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll see
>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together much
>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people
> would
>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains,
> fly
>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>
>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>
>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree
> about
>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be a
>
>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well, you
>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE

>
>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying
> the
>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are
> not
>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>
>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice that
>>> is
>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right
>>> to
>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms such
>>> as
>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>
>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common
> sense
>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>
>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>
>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any one
>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based
>>> on
>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>
>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>
>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to
> go
>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,

>>>>>>
 >>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there
 > are
 >>>>> tons
 >>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
 >>>>> tells
 >>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong sense
 >>>>> of
 >>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference point,
 >>>>> what
 >>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use to
 >>> decide
 >>>>>> what is right and wrong?
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so with
 >>>>> no
 >>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
 >>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept as
 >>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has
 > a
 >>> proven
 >>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
 >>>>> or
 >>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
 >>> anger
 >>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose experience
 >>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee that
 >>> person
 >>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the
 > whole.
 >>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing, lying,
 >>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those can
 >>> be
 >>>>> means
 >>>>>> of survival.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
 >>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
 >>>>> even
 >>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any

> form
 >>>>> of
 >>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
 >>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
 >>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to make
 >>>>> the
 >>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only
 >>> be
 >>>>> an
 >>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time,
 >>> and
 >>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
 > to
 >>> person,
 >>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
 >>>>> be
 >>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
 >>>>> their
 >>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't
 >>> have
 >>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
 > no
 >>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences of
 >>> either,
 >>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
 >>>>> - it
 >>>>>> would just be another event in time.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
 > in
 >>> whether
 >>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions. With
 >>>>> moral
 >>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate drastically
 >>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in reasoning
 >>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
 > when
 >>>>> we
 >>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
 >>>>> to
 >>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be no
 > power

>>>>> in
>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
> loving
>>>>> God
>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God in
> the
>>>>> way
>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
> greed
>>>>> and
>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a strong
>>>>> morals
>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
>>> pretty
>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
> even
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence
>>> and
>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We ignore
>>>>> car
>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured
>>> and
>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the

>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
> Pope
>>>>> quote
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>>> religion
>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>>>> might
>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else in
> many
>>>>> of
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked
>>> to,
>>>>> and
>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>>>> world
>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have here.
>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At best,
>>>>> their
>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
>>>>> of
>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
> own
>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
> kind
>>>>> of
>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
> thing
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God, and
>>> hence
>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice
> to
>>> believe
>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name of
> Allah
>>>>> the
>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments
>>> in

>>>>> 24
>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there is
> a
>>> sad,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear
>>> -
>>>>> it's
>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
> whims
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day. That
>>>>> also
>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God
> and
>>>>> is
>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope
>>> as
>>>>> a
>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
> then
>>>>> at
>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
>>>>> be
>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
> President
>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 15:58:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>>>> better
>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
>>> for
>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
> in
>>> any
>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
> others?
>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy Islam

>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
> this
>>>>> forum
>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
>>> to
>>>>> take
>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
> is
>>> to
>>>>> give
>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to not
>>> believe
>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from public
>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public
> in
>>>>> a
>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is to
>>> outlaw
>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the world
>>>>> as a
>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
>>> wins
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
>>>>> in
>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
> the
>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
> the
>>>>> very
>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10 hours
>>>>> of
>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>> :-(....
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>> Dedric

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"

>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread -...

>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current

>>>>>>>> administration

>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons

>>>> for

>>>>>>>> perusing

>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Religion.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great

>>>>>>>> Awakening"

>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing as

>>> he

>>>> sees

>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against

>>>>>>>> terrorists

>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that

> he

>>>>>>>> depicts

>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."

>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of

> trouble

>>>>>>>> (as

>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily

>>> go

>>>>>>>> down

>>>>>>>> hill from here.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)

>>>>>>>> 59

>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Gene

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> `

>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f3862@linux...

>
> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature of
> the threat.

Agreed.

>
> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
> before the 9/11 attack.
>
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terrorism
>
> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
> preemptive attack policy. :^)

I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has always been the *clear and present danger* prerogative but it needs to be based on 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 trun around and blame Bush for the decisions made based on the intellegence 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...
> >> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
it's
> >> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others

do

> >> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as well,

> >> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.

> >>

> >> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money and

> >> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It

> >> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared

> >> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have

> >> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.

> >>

> >> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How do

> >> you declare war on a tactic?

> >>

> >> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in

> >> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.

> >>

> >> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist

> >> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get

> >> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are

> >> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with

> >> fantasies of violence in the USA.

> >>

> >> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing holy

> >> about war.

> >>

> >> Cheers,

> >> -Jamie

> >> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

> >>

> >>

> >>

> >> DJ wrote:

> >>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda

> > just

> >>> came out with an ultimatum stating that it's full on war now and the

> > west

> >>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to

> > Islam. So

> >>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?

> >>>

> >>>

> >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message

news:450ee7ef@linux...

> >>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our

> > own.
> >>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
> >>>>
> >>>> Cheers,
> >>>> -Jamie
> >>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> DJ wrote:
> >>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line
is
> >>> 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
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 would have been
> > an
> >>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.

> >>>>>
 > >>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
 > >>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung
 on
 > >>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe
 > >>> while
 > >>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
 > >>>>> actual way the solar system works.
 > >>>>>
 > >>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
 > >>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
 > > about
 > >>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
 clever
 > >>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
 ago,
 > >>> and
 > >>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
 > >>>>>
 > >>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
 who,
 > >>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
 evidence
 > >>> of
 > >>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
 > > who
 > >>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
 > >>>>>
 > >>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
 > > bucks
 > >>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push
 > > to
 > >>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
 our
 > >>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
 sometimes
 > >>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
 > >>>>>
 > >>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
 to
 > >>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
 > >>> spreading
 > >>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
 power.
 > >>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
 > >>> focus
 > >>>>> on the use of force.
 > >>>>>

> >>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare victory.
> >>> ;^)
> >>>>> Have a great week!
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> DC wrote:
> >>>>> I thought this was worth reading 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

> >>>>> Regensberg, 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

> >>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
> >>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> >>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> >>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> >>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> >>>>>

> >>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> >>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of

> >>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that

> >>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> 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

> >>>>>> 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

> >>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

> >>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> >>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not

> >>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

> >>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is

> >>>>>> lost on them.
> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
> >>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

> >>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
> >>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
> >>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
> >>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
> >>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
> >>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
> >>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

> >>>>>> 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.
> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

> >>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
> >>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
> >>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
> >>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> 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 globalization

> >>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,

> >>>>>> both are in decline.

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> Where the force of r

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 16:03:31 GMT

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

eason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

> >>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse

> >>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> >>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

> >>>>>>

> >>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.

> >>>>>>

> >>>

> >

> >I'm going to be out there again tomorrow. I'll bring my camera and post some
pics.

;o)

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
news:450eca3f@linux...

> Deej,

>

> Three things:

>

> Holy Water

> Silver Bullets (and gun, duh)

> Crucifix

>
> Hey, better safe than sorry!
>
> ;>)
>
> Tony
>
>
> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> news:450c1c47\$1@linux...
> > I'm going to be meeting the owner of the property onsite next week. I'm
> > going to ask him about this. The headstones of these graves are very old
> > and
> > discolored by time and weather. I'll tell you something though, this guy
> > is
> > in his 80's, shoes horses for a living and looks about my age. I know
one
> > of
> > his cousins who is in his 90's, still slings 70 lb bales of hay from the
> > ground to the bed of a flatbed trailer with one arm and looks like he's
in
> > his 50's. He just married a 50 something Phillipino woman. The
Martinez/De
> > La Madrid folks have some mighty impressive genetics. I wonder if some
of
> > them might have long pointy canines.
> >
> > ;0)
> >
> >
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450c196d@linux...
> >>
> >> Do you suppose there was a fresh burial in an old grave, or someone
> >> stealing skeletal parts? Might want to report that one to the county
> >> sheriff.
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> -Jamie
> >> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
> >>
> >>
> >> DJ wrote:
> >> > Strange.....I know ya'll think I'm nuts anyway so I can be honest
> >> > here.
> >> > Back in 1966 I was driving home from a gig with our drummer about 1AM
> >> > on
> >> > Loop 820 in Ft. Worth Tx. We both saw something sorta like this
except

> > the
> >> > tail wasn't nearly as long and it was moving at incredible speed and
> >> > changing directions instantaneously. It was right over Carswell AFB
and
> > a
> >> > few minutes after whatever this was started dancing across the sky,
you
> >> > could see a couple of jets scrambling, at which time the *thing* just
> > sorta'
> >> > went *poof* and was gone.
> >> >
> >> > I saw something else *incredibly* strange day before yesterday. I was
> > out in
> >> > a very isolated wilderness area bordering an Indian reservation up in
> > the
> >> > mountains. I had parked my car and walked about a mile off the main
> > road. I
> >> > know the guy who owns this property and was scouting a location for a
> > road
> >> > through there to reach an area where some gas wells are going to be
> > drilled
> >> > next year. It was a beautiful fall day with the sagebrush blooming,
> > aspens,
> >> > cottonwoods, elms and oaks are starting to turn and there had been a
> >> > downpour the night before. Everything is green and a thousand other
> > colors.
> >> > Lots of birds, deer, badgers, prairie dogs flying and scurrying around
> >> > getting ready for winter. I was sorta walking along looking at the
> > mountains
> >> > around me and I noticed that the normal bird sound had stopped and so
I
> >> > started scanning the area around me. this can be a sign of bears or
> > cougars
> >> > and I wasn't packin'. About 100' to my left was a fenced area
overgrown
> > with
> >> > vegetation and I walked over to it. It was the family cemetery. It
was
> > about
> >> > 100' x 100' and there were about 20 old grave plots in there. I
started
> >> > checking the names and dates because I am going to need to prepare an
> >> > affidavit of heirship of this family in order to determine who will
> >> > sign
> > the
> >> > paperwork for this roadway and who will get paid. The owner already
> >> > told
> > me

> > > that the land has been in the family since the early 1900's and was
> > patented
> > > to his great grandfather. None of his relatives ever left wills so
I'm
> > gonna
> > > have to unravel this family tree. As I started noting the names and
> > dates of
> > > birth/death I was walking along a row of graves and there were three
> > graves
> > > of brothers (I think) that had birth dates in the 1880's and they
each
> > died
> > > between 1945 and 1947. I noted their names and moved on down the line
> > and
> > > all of a sudden I got an absolutely wierd feeling and the hari on the
> > back
> > > of my neck started to tingle. I turned around and it looked at these
> > graves
> > > again. I could figure out what it was about them that was different.
> > Then it
> > > struck me. all of the other graves in this cemetery were overgrown.
The
> > dirt
> > > on top of these three graves was relatively fresh and it was obvious
> > where
> > > the rain the night before had turned some of the dirt ot mud which
had
> > sorta
> > > molded to the contour of the crown of the grave but none of theese
> > > three
> > > graves had anything at all growing on the graves. How does that
happen
> > when
> > > theses guys have been dead since the 1940's and every other grave out
> > there
> > > is overgrown?
> > >
> > > Very strange.
> > >
> > > Deej
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > "rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:rkrkg2psprgevsfi1vet6993tno42apv48@4ax.com...
> > >> no but i did have a friend who was a flamer....
> > >>
> > >>

> > >
> > > On 15 Sep 2006 17:52:56 +1000, "steve the artguy"
> > > <artguy@somethingorother.net> wrote:
> > >
> > >> Any of you guys have any friends with flaming spaceships?
> > >>
> > >> <http://tinyurl.com/rnqha>
> > >>
> > >> -steve
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
> "Uptown Jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

> And speaking of Iraq, how the hell are we ever gonna spare the man-power
to
> fight other countries while we are so severely over-taxed in Iraq? Is it
any
> accident that Iran has been so loud and obnoxious recently? They know we
are
> compromised tactically. They laugh loud and long every day at our current
> difficulties.
> Jimmy
>

will be going into Iran soon. Military capacity or not. :-(
Gene for ... many times people.
THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
This is ... Paris site (Music) Remember...

Keep you're Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
> Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
> than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>
> Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>
> Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
> foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
> government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
> lasting and beneficial peace.
>
> Cheers,

> -Jamie
> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>
>
>TCB wrote:
>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would be
>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point.
>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX'
it's
>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith. Probably
>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's
sort
>> of about this very topic.
>>
>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29_81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just
as
>>
>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>>
>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some

>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that.
>>
>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing something
>>
>>> for some other reason, of course.
>>>
>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the

>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>> problem with that.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>
>>>
>>> TCB wrote:
>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>
>>>> [faith  /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation\[feyth\]](#)

>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's ability.
>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis
>> would
>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the firm
>> faith
>>>> of the Pilgrims.
>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.:
>> to
>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish faith.
>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise, engagement,
>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,
>> allegiance,
>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent troubles.
>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
through
>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>>
>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can
>> do
>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but
>> do
>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have faith
>> but
>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary definition.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals
>> take
>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have
>> faith.
>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married,
etc.
>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone. Religious
>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
>>>>>>
>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find
>> its
>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
the
>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
see
>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together
much
>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people
>> would
>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire other
>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains,
>> fly
>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
>>
>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
>>
>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated stories
>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different deities.
>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes violently,
>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree
>> about
>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be
a
>>
>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,
you
>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
>>
>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying
>> the
>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are
>> not
>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>

>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice
that
>>>> is
>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the right
>>>> to
>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms
such
>>>> as
>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no human
>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no

>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common
>> sense
>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to sort
>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a

>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these additional
>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the freedom
>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any
one
>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system based
>>>> on
>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>
>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many examples
>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and hijacked
>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other cases.
>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and
>>
>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to
>> go
>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there

>> are
 >>>>> tons
 >>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of itself
 >>>>> tells
 >>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong
 sense
 >>>>> of
 >>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference
 point,
 >>>>> what
 >>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use
 to
 >>>> decide
 >>>>>> what is right and wrong?
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so
 with
 >>>>> no
 >>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws since
 >>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept
 as
 >>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has
 >> a
 >>>> proven
 >>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the reasoning
 >>>>> or
 >>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred, abuse,
 >>>> anger
 >>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
 experience
 >>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
 that
 >>>> person
 >>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the
 >> whole.
 >>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing,
 lying,
 >>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
 can
 >>>> be

>>>>> means
 >>>>>> of survival.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the differences
 >>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming societies
 >>>>>>> even
 >>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any
 >> form
 >>>>>> of
 >>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less relationships,
 >>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they aren't
 >>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to
 make
 >>>>>> the
 >>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would only
 >>>> be
 >>>>>> an
 >>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the time,
 >>>> and
 >>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
 >> to
 >>>> person,
 >>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would either
 >>>>>> be
 >>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time because
 >>>>>>> their
 >>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we wouldn't
 >>>> have
 >>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
 >> no
 >>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences
 of
 >>>> either,
 >>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad consequence
 >>>>>> - it
 >>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
 >> in
 >>>> whether
 >>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
 With

>>>>> moral
>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
drastically
>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
reasoning
>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
>> when
>>>>> we
>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that option
>>>>> to
>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
no
>> power
>>>>> in
>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
>> loving
>>>>> God
>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
in
>> the
>>>>> way
>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can discuss
>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider insulting,
>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable concept;
>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
>> greed
>>>>> and
>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
strong
>>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...

>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your response
>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
>> even
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict, violence
>>>> and
>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single largest
>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We
ignore
>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of tortured
>>>> and
>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
>> Pope
>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening, all-accepting
>>>> religion
>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western Muslims
>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
in
>> many
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have talked
>>>> to,
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a different
>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
here.
>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At
best,
>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under threat
&g

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

/>

>>>>>>> side of the violent jihad. Nowhere is that more clear than in
>>>>>>> the Islamist reaction to the Pope.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> With the Pope scheduled to visit Turkey in November the Islamists
>>>>>>> are rejecting any apology from Vatican spokespersons and demand
>>>>>>> to hear from the Pope himself. This would place raging mobs of
>>>>>>> semi-literate Islamist thugs in the position of forcing the
>>>>>>> leader of Christendom to bow before them.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> In this demand for submission they are joined by the secularist
>>>>>>> mouthpiece. In its September 16 edition the Times editorializes:

>>>>>>> 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.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> our categories, even that of rationality...(The Islamic) God is

>>>>>>> Islam embraces this description. In offering this description of
>>>>>>> Islam, Benedict refers to the views of leading modern French
>>>>>>> Islamist R. Arnaldez as discussed in the writings of Professor
>>>>>>> Theodore Khoury of Munster.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Benedict asserts that without reason, or without God, there can

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> 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 globalization
>>>>>>> carries the Western tradition of reason throughout the world,
>>>>>>> both are in decline.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse

>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.

>>>>>>>>

>>>

>

>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:

>

>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>I assume we all think that schools in the Middle East where children are

>>indoctrinated with anti-western ideas mixed with big dose of religious
zeal

>>

>>Gene

>>

>

>Right.

>

>http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=co1_9IR9EpM

It's a twisting of the truth! The children are not being taut to kill people,
they are being taught to be an army for Christ, to spread the word of god.

The terms they are using like soldiers, are a figure of speech. It should
be soul-diers

Of corse they would inter view an anti Christian to get their twisted take
on it. I know your on the left coast, but come on Gene!"James McCloskey"

<excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:

>>

>>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>

>>>
>>>
>>>I assume we all think that schools in the Middle East where children are
>>>indoctrinated with anti-western ideas mixed with big dose of religious
>zeal

right?
>>>
>>>Gene
>>>
>>
>>Right.
>>
>>http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=co1_9IR9EpM
>
>It's a twisting of the truth! The children are not being taut to kill people,
>they are being taught to be an army for Christ, to spread the word of god.
> The terms they are using like soldiers, are a figure of speech. It should
>be soul-diers
>
>Of corse they would inter view an anti Christian to get their twisted take
>on it. I know your on the left coast, but come on Gene!
>

Lov mi spell Cheack, woorks gooodIranian Leader Urges More Papal Protests

<http://apnews.excite.com/article/20060919/D8K7OPTO0.html>This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C6DB9D.8E0553A0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Gene and all others with comments,

Is the Neve 33609 even worth the bother?

I want to use the \$50 coupon on a plug. I'm strongly considering the = Precision Multiband.

If it sounds as good as it looks and functions as simply as it appears I = think it could make

a difference in my lower end mastering projects (the only ones I do). =

Now I'm using Paris EQ,=20

NoLimit, Paris Comp, but no real pristine compression. The Waves =
multiband is average at best=20
to my ear. That's all I've got around here in higher end software. =
I've delved into the Waves Ren Comp=20
a few times too. It's okay. The Sakis method is too involved for my =
limited mastering hours. I typically
have to get a CD done in less than four hours to make it worth the =
client's/my while.

For \$200 or less is there a better choice for an easy to use multiband =
comp? Otherwise I might spring for the=20
1073 but I have two Neve pres here in hardware form that I track with =
alot.

Is the UAD 140 way better than the SIR plates? If not I'll pass on that =
too.

I'm thinking the Cambridge EQ (just got that and like it) with the =
Precision Multiband Comp would be a=20
fine addition to a sweeter sounding master and even individual tracks =
here and there. =20

All opinions welcome!
Tom

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message =
news:450f504d\$1@linux...

"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:

>
>
>DJ,
>Have you had a chance to hear it yet?
>Tom

Not DJ but...

I had it for a few hours before my temp license timed out prematurely. =
Sounds

nice and fairly close to the real thing. I did a short comparison to =
my Portico5043.

The UAD has a similar flavor and controls the dynamics in a very =
similar

way, but it is missing the creamy sound of the hardware - And I hate =
people

that describe hardware as creamy :=AC)=20

Since the plug requires an entire card or it must be rendered, I don't =
think

I will get it. I might as well render the real thing.
Gene

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?

<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

-----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C6DB9D.8E0553A0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Gene and all others with =
comments,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Is the Neve 33609 even worth the=20
bother?</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>I want to use the $50 coupon on a =
plug.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
strongly considering the Precision Multiband.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>If it sounds as good as it looks and =
functions as=20
simply as it appears I think it could make</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>a difference in my lower end mastering =
projects=20
(the only ones I do).&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>NoLimit, Paris Comp, </FONT><FONT =
face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>but no real pristine compression.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
The Waves multiband is =
average at=20
best </FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>to my ear.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
That's all I've got =
around here in=20
higher end software.&nbsp;</FONT><FONT face=3DArial =
size=3D2>into the=20
Waves Ren Comp </FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>a few times too.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
It's okay.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
The Sakis=20
method is too involved for my limited mastering hours.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
I=20
```


typically

have to get a CD done in less than four hours to make it worth the client's/my while.

For \$200 or less is there a better choice for an easy to use multiband comp? Otherwise I might spring for the 1073 but I have two Neve pres here in hardware form that I track with alot.

Is the UAD 140 way better than the SIR plates? If not I'll pass on that too.

I'm thinking the Cambridge EQ (just got that and like it) with the Precision Multiband Comp would be a fine addition to a sweeter sounding master and even individual tracks here and there.

All opinions welcome!

Tom

"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message

[news:450f504d\\$1@linux](news:450f504d$1@linux)...
"Tom Bruhl"<arpeggio@comcast.net> = wrote:
<
<DJ,
<Have you had a chance to hear it yet?
<Tom

Not DJ but...

I had it for a few hours before my temp license timed out prematurely. Sounds nice and fairly close to the real thing. I did a short comparison to my Portico5043.
The UAD has =

a=20

similar flavor and controls the dynamics in a very similar
way, but =
it is=20

missing the creamy sound of the hardware - And I hate =
people
that=20

describe hardware as creamy :=AC)
Since the plug requires an =
entire card or=20

it must be rendered, I don't think
I will get it. I might as well =
render=20

the real thing.
Gene
</BLOCKQUOTE>

<DIV>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, =
and=20

you?
<A=20

href=3D"http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html">http://www.polesoft.com/refer=
..html </DIV></BODY ></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C6DB9D.8E0553A0--instigator...;o)

On 19 Sep 2006 11:56:40 +1000, "gene Lennon"

<glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>

>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> 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 '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. She generally won't be

>>recording more than two tracks at a time, four absolute max. I don't think

>>she'd be mixing more than eight tracks at any one time either. I will

>>certainly be surfing myself to see what's out there, but I'd take you folk's

>>recommendations, even over say... Mr. Spock's --although he did some pretty

>>nifty stuff analyzing those whale sounds.

>>Thank you, thank you.

>>MR

>>

>>

>I would go with a MacBook Pro and run Cubase under XP/ Bootcamp for the next

>few months. The UB version should be out soon. For just a few tracks the

>This is an extremely fast box, and with an external drive you can do serious
>recording, editing and mixing on it.

>For simple needs, I would suggest an M-Audio Firewire interface. Low cost,

>good drivers, works Mac and PC fine and she can even go to Pro Tools M-Powered

>later if she likes. (Did I say that?)

>GeneWhat are you doing checking out Aussie newspapers, Deej?

Looking to move over here?--
Martin Harrington
www.lendaneer-sound.com

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:450f87ac\$1@linux...
> <http://www.news.com.au/entertainment/story/0,23663,20437931-10388,00.html>
>
> I was present at a few recording sessions with Willie & friends back in
> the
> early/mid 80's. I thought we smoked up all of the pot on earth then and
> there wasn't any left. I've still got a hangover from one of those
> sessions.....
>
> As stupid as this was, the stupidity is likely a result of haviung smoked
> so
> much pot so maybe he can plead insanity. I hope he doesn't do
> time.....and
> he very possibly cound
>
>
>Don't you think this is just a marketing ploy? Duh

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:
>What are you doing checking out Aussie newspapers, DeeJ?
>Looking to move over here?--
>Martin Harrington
>www.lendaneer-sound.com
>
>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>news:450f87ac\$1@linux...
>> <http://www.news.com.au/entertainment/story/0,23663,20437931-10388,00.html>
>>
>> I was present at a few recording sessions with Willie & friends back in

>> the
>> early/mid 80's. I thought we smoked up all of the pot on earth then and
>> there wasn't any left. I've still got a hangover from one of those
>> sessions.....
>>
>> As stupid as this was, the stupidity is likely a result of haviung smoked

>> so
>> much pot so maybe he can plead insanity. I hope he doesn't do
>> time.....and
>> he very possibly cound
>>
>>

>>

>

>That's a pathetic answer. Yeah we don't need no stinking diplomats! Everyone else is nuts, crazy and a lunatic. DJ, I thought you had better answers than that.

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>I think I answered yur question as much as I can by stat8ing that a diplomat

>cannot do anything unless there is willingness to participate in a

>meaningful and sincere dialog.....so keeping in mind that a negotiator must

>have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some sort of

>track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be a

>credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?

>

>

>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f310e\$1@linux...

>>

>> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's world?

>>

>>

>> "justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:

>> >Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.

>> >

>> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...

>> >>

>> >> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?

>> >>

>> >> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in

>> >> today's

>> >> world?

>> >

>> >

>>

>

>Huh??

--

Martin Harrington

www.lendaneer-sound.com

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450fcfb1\$1@linux...

>

> Don't you think this is just a marketing ploy? Duh

>

> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>>What are you doing checking out Aussie newspapers, DeeJ?

>>Looking to move over here?--

>>Martin Harrington
>>www.lendaneer-sound.com
>>
>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>>news:450f87ac\$1@linux...
>>> <http://www.news.com.au/entertainment/story/0,23663,20437931-10388,00.html>
>>>
>>> I was present at a few recording sessions with Willie & friends back in
>
>>> the
>>> early/mid 80's. I thought we smoked up all of the pot on earth then and
>>> there wasn't any left. I've still got a hangover from one of those
>>> sessions.....
>>>
>>> As stupid as this was, the stupidity is likely a result of haviung
>>> smoked
>
>>> so
>>> much pot so maybe he can plead insanity. I hope he doesn't do
>>> time.....and
>>> he very possibly cound
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:
>>
>>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>

>>>
>>>
>>>I assume we all think that schools in the Middle East where children are
>>>indoctrinated with anti-western ideas mixed with big dose of religious
>zeal

right?
>>>
>>>Gene
>>>
>>
>>Right.
>>
>>http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=co1_9lR9EpM

>
>It's a twisting of the truth! The children are not being taut to kill people,
>they are being taught to be an army for Christ, to spread the word of god.
> The terms they are using like soldiers, are a figure of speech. It should
>be soul-diers
>
>Of corse they would inter view an anti Christian to get their twisted take
>on it. I know your on the left coast, but come on Gene!
>

So you are OK with what Becky Fischer is doing?
Before you answer, here is another quote from her that has been recorded
by the press with her permission.
"I want to teach kids t

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 16:19:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t;>>>> of
>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our country
>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
>> own
>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
>> kind
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
>> thing
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
and
>>>> hence
>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice
>> to
>>>> believe
>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
of
>> Allah
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10 commandments
>>>> in
>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there

is
>> a
>>>> sad,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should fear
>>>> -
>>>>> it's
>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
>> whims
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
That
>>>>> also
>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God
>> and
>>>>> is
>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false hope
>>>> as
>>>>> a
>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
>> then
>>>>> at
>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we should
>>>>> be
>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>> President
>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief really
>>>>> better
>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong accompanies
>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference point
>>>> for
>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
>> in
>>>> any
>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
>> others?
>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy
Islam
>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
>> this
>>>>> forum
>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's intent
>>>> to

>>>>> take
>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
>> is
>>>> to
>>>>> give
>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
not
>>>> believe
>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
public
>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public
>> in
>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is
to
>>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the
world
>>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party always
>>>> wins
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any validity
>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
>> the
>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
>> the
>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic ideology.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10
hours
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>> :-((....
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
-...
>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the current
>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based reasons
>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier motivation.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third Great
>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing
as
>>>> he
>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight against
>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that
>> he
>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of
>> trouble
>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be headed?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could easily
>>>> go
>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201594_pf.html)
>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> `

>>You know, if the Hindus are right, then the man in that video was Adolf Hitler in the last life, and NOW he must have sex with THAT woman...

Bends the mind just to think of it huh?

More fun:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RqqQdRimuG0>

DC

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>I think this one is just as much fun:

><http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CCODIhAXbQM&NR>

>

>.....and these are pretty cool, dont'cha think?

><http://www.armorofgodpjs.com/>

>

>Yep....there are whack jobs everywhere out there. I wonder how much of this

>stuff is backlash from the broadcasts we've been seeing for years of the

>automations produced by the madrasas

>

>

>

>

>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote in message news:450f256f\$1@linux...

>>

>> "gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:

>> >

>> >

>> >Sorry - I can't help myself.

>> >

>> >

>> >I assume we all think that schools in the Middle East where children are

>> >indoctrinated with anti-western ideas mixed with big dose of religious

>> >zeal

>> >and combined with preaching the virtues of martyrdom are a bad thing.

>> >right?

>> >

>> >Gene

>> >

>>

>> Right.

>>

>> http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=co1_9lR9EpM

>

> <http://www.news.com.au/entertainment/story/0,23663,20437931-10388,00.html>

I was present at a few recording sessions with Willie & friends back in the early/mid 80's. I thought we smoked up all of the pot on earth then and there wasn't any left. I've still got a hangover from one of those sessions.....

As stupid as this was, the stupidity is likely a result of having smoked so much pot so maybe he can plead insanity. I hope he doesn't do time.....and he very possibly could. 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 of 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 resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.

Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

DJ wrote:

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f3862@linux...

>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature of

>> the threat.

>
> Agreed.
>
>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
>> before the 9/11 attack.
>>
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terrorism
>>
>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>
> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has always been
> the *clear and present danger* prerogative but it needs to be based on
> 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 trun 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...
>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
> it's
>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others
> do
>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
> well,
>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>>>

>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money
> and
>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to have
>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>>>
>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How
> do
>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>>>
>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
>>>>
>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to get
>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>>>
>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing
> holy
>>>> about war.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al Quaeda
>>> just
>>>>> came out with an ultimatum stating that it's full on war now and the
>>> west
>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
>>> Islam. So
>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
>>> own.
>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie

>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom line
> is
>>>>> 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
> 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 would have been
>>> an
>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church hung
> on
>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the universe

>>>>> while
>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes the
>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
>>> about
>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
> clever
>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
> ago,
>>>>> and
>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
> who,
>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
> evidence
>>>>> of
>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing, and
>>> who
>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
>>> bucks
>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who push
>>> to
>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
> our
>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
> sometimes
>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
> to
>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
>>>>> spreading
>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
> power.
>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and the
>>>>> focus
>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> victory.
>>>>> ;^)
>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading 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

>>>>>>> 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

>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular humanists
>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

>>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
>>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
>>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
>>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
>>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
>>>>>>> Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

>>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
>>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
>>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
>>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
>>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> 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

>>>>>>>> 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

>>>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

>>>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought than

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> description of the Islamic God as being unbound by reason is not
>>>>>>>> an insult, it is an Islamic article of faith. What Muslims and

>>>>>>>> dialogue asserting his belief in Christianity. How dare he not

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> being Muslim? But they are not bound by reason to the point is
>>>>>>>> lost on them.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> this, the Times implicitly recognizes the Islamists are waging a
>>>>>>> propaganda jihad against the Pope and by extension against

>>>>>>> jihad, but not your violent jihad.
>>>>>>>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 17:13:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

e film is

unbiased. Remember when Willie pulled off to the side of the road a couple of years back 'cause he had a bit too much to smoke and decided to sleep it off? The state trooper that busted him confiscated a half a joint from his ashtray, and asked "do you have any more of this Mr. Nelson?". Willie's reply was "Officer, that's all you'll need...". :)

Willie said in an interview that he had smoked pot every day if his life since 1956, with the exception of three months when he was preparing to test for his black belt. DJ--I was at his house a couple of times back in that ere also, and he always had a salad bowl full of buds on the table...

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> <http://www.news.com.au/entertainment/story/0,23663,20437931-10388,00.html>
>
> I was present at a few recording sessions with Willie & friends back in the
> early/mid 80's. I thought we smoked up all of the pot on earth then and
> there wasn't any left. I've still got a hangover from one of those
> sessions.....
>
> As stupid as this was, the stupidity is likely a result of haviung smoked
> so
> much pot so maybe he can plead insanity. I hope he doesn't do time.....and
> he very possibly cound
>
>
> First, if the jihadis were as loudly condemned by Muslims as the crowd you list below are condemned by Christians, we would have a more peaceful world, wouldn't we?

I did live sound for a group once that had a bunch of little kids so worked up with a witches brew of extreme patriotism and emotional faith that several kids fainted. The bigshot who ran the event actually yelled at me "LOUDER LOUDER". Today, I would power down and walk away from such an event and tell them to keep their damn money. These people are essentially atheists in that they nearly zero faith in God to convict people and win them over, so they must do it themselves with blubbering and manipulation.

But why do you guys need to lie about it? They weren't worshipping to Bush, they were *praying* for him! Don't you think he NEEDS it??

I abhor the connecting of faith to ultra-patriotism, because the govt. is so fallible and may betray us at any time. God is not fallible, and faith and country should never be conflated.

So, yeah, Gene, there are extremists, but what I want to know is why you lie about them and accept lies about Christians so easily? You apparently hate Christians much more than Muslims, since your criticisms are only pointed at Christians.

C'mon, let's hear you have a go at the Muslims for a bit!

Need some websites? movies? comedy? Think there is a lack of evidence of the evil they have planned for you and yours, and have been acting on for 30 years now?

Are you unable to criticize Muslims? Have you drunken the liberal kool-aid?

expiring minds want to know!

DC

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>How about Fred Phelps, or some of the Christian/Skinheads, or abortion bombers?
>Are you completely unwilling to admit that there are some extremists in the
>Christian movement?

>

>Gene

>They film is more fair than the TV show about the film that you posted from YouTube, for sure. That TV special was dripping

with sarcasm and only interviewed obvious secularists. And yes, the film either misunderstood several things going on or deliberately misrepresented them.

That camp, and her tactics have been roundly and loudly criticized by many Christians. Were you aware of this?

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>

>P.S. Becky Fischer is promoting the film. She has said that that film accurately
>portrays the activates at the camp and she does not understand why people
>would be upset by what they see in the film because the world needs someone
>like her to straighten out our children and form an army against all the
>evil in the world (all non-believers). So who are you to say the film is

>unbiased.Does anybody remember that post from Chuck? ;o)

Just a little hint. I love talking politics as much as the next man of course...
but I refrain these days due to my role as head newsgroup dude...

Mind you we seem to be staying fairly civil about things generally which is great to see. No intolerable meaningless abuse that I've noticed. Perhaps we could move some of the politics on to the General group though if we want to keep it going. I know some on the group aren't fans of politics in the main group, which I understand and appreciate.

Finish your discussions if you feel the need, but any new threads might be better placed in General if that's cool... I don't want to dampen the discussion. Just don't want the audio discussion on the main group getting lost in the politics...

Thought I'd better say something as it's showing no signs of easing off...
...don't mean to spoil the party. ;o)

Cheers,

Kim."Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:

>

>Gene and all others with comments,
>Is the Neve 33609 even worth the bother?

>

>Tom

>

many software tools that I have purchased that I use infrequently or never, and if I only bought what I really needed, I would only have a fraction of

Gene

Actually, the only way to significantly improve the native sound of Paris is with improved converters, hardware and clocking. Plugins always seem to

yes, but not many. The Paris compressors are a weakness so any good plugin will help, but good hardware is still better. Thought my last post's title might not attract the right attention, and couple
be bothered actually deleting it. ;o)

Please read the "Friends back in Ireland" post if you didn't already...

Cheers,

Kim."Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:

>and couple

>be bothered actually deleting it. ;o)

Couple be bothered? Try couldn't be bothered...

....is it dislexia if you just type the complete wrong word? What's with that?!?

Cheers,

Kim.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. :O

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 Tracktion 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 fore backs ups 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 24/48 at 3 ms buffer on the RME Fireface 400. If you raise

>>the buffer then 48 tracks should be no problem.
>>
>>
>> She generally won't be
>>
>>>recording more than two tracks at a time, four absolute max. I don't
>
> think
>
>>>she'd be mixing more than eight tracks at any one time either. I will
>>>certainly be surfing myself to see what's out there, but I'd take you
>
> folk's
>
>>>recommendations, even over say... Mr. Spock's --although he did some
>
> pretty
>
>>>nifty stuff analyzing those whale sounds.
>>>Thank you, thank you.
>>>MR
>>>
>>>
>>
>>The current laptops well use the new Core 2 Duo CPUs.
>>
>
> 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 <http://www.adkproaudio.com/>

(859) 635-5762I was taking that for granted, since we all pulled together to help fund Chuck's efforts. I have no problems paying for upgrades that are delivered.

AA

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message

news:450f1a7f@linux...

> Do we have any money to pay him? I don't think he's gonna work for free.

>

> ;oP

>

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

> news:450e9b9e@linux...

>> Find out if dude is interested in writing a windows Vista and OS-x driver

> :)

>>

>> AA

>>

>>

>> "DJ" <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)

>> >

>> >

>> >

>> >

>>

>>

>

>Kissinger?!? A great diplomat? A great diplomat can create a strategic victory from a position of weakness. Kissinger wrought strategic disasters out of positions of incomparable strength. Extending the Vietnam war into Cambodia and Laos, running operation Condor to destabilize a moderately leftist regime

in Chile, blanket support for Suharto in Indonesia in the 70's. These just come off the top of my head as places that destroyed US credibility in places where it was unnecessary to be involved at all.

TCB

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>Anyone, anyone? Beuller?

>

>So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in today's

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

>

>Are you unable to criticize Muslims? Have you drunken the liberal

>kool-aid?

>

>expiring minds want to know!

>

>DC

>

I posted the link about Becky Fischer for a specific reason. It was not to embarrass or criticize any true believers, but to point out that some extremists exist on the Christian side. My Point?

It is unfair to paint the modern Christian movement with the brush of Becky Fischer, or Fred Phelps. The Christian movement may have a few extremists, but they do not represent the majority of good people following the Christian cause. Funny, because that is the exact point I am also trying to make about the modern Moslem movement, which is not just a bunch of knife wielding maniacs. It is largely a mixture of fundamentalists combined with many who want to see more progressive reform in the Moslem church.

Of the over one billion Moslems in the world today perhaps 1% are extremist

takes one with a WMD to cause great harm. But what about the 99%?

I am still waiting for someone to answer my question about what we should do if we suffer a major attack and a Moslem extremist group takes credit.

Should we kill 1,000,000 people? How about 1,000,000,000?

I do condemn Moslem radical violence . Killing a Nun because of what the Pope said is unconscionable but it is not all Moslems.

P.S. Please point out my lies. I may be delusional, but I think I am trying to bring some balance to a very one-sided and highly charged issue.

GeneOk, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?Marketing for a new album or tour!

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>Huh??

>--

>Martin Harrington

>www.lendaneer-sound.com

>

>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450fcbf1\$1@linux...

>>

>> Don't you think this is just a marketing ploy? Duh

>>

>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>>>What are you doing checking out Aussie newspapers, DeeJ?

>>>Looking to move over here?--

>>>Martin Harrington

>>>www.lendaneer-sound.com

>>>

>>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message

>>>news:450f87ac\$1@linux...

>>>> <http://www.news.com.au/entertainment/story/0,23663,20437931-10388,00.html>

>>>>

>>>> I was present at a few recording sessions with Willie & friends back in

>>

>>>> the

>>>> early/mid 80's. I thought we smoked up all of the pot on earth then and

>>>> there wasn't any left. I've still got a hangover from one of those

>>>> sessions.....

>>>>

>>>> As stupid as this was, the stupidity is likely a result of haviung

>>>> smoked

>>

>>>> so

>>>> much pot so maybe he can plead insanity. I hope he doesn't do

>>>> time.....and

>>>> he very possibly cound

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>>

>>

>

>I'm willing to pay for any upgrades as well.

respect
Nappy

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

>I was taking that for granted, since we all pulled together to help fund

>Chuck's efforts. I have no problems paying for upgrades that are delivered.

>AA

>

>

>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message

>news:450f1a7f@linux...

>> Do we have any money to pay him? I don't think he's gonna work for free.

>>

>> ;oP

>>

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

>> news:450e9b9e@linux...

>>> Find out if dude is interested in writing a windows Vista and OS-x driver

>> :)

>>>

>>> AA

>>>

>>>

>>> "DJ" <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)

>>> >

>>> >

>>> >

>>> >

>>>

>>>

>>

>>

>

>OK John.....are you going to send a diplomat to talk to himself? I agree it's pathetic but in irder for diplomacy to happen, there has to be more than one diplomat. You want me to name a few.....I can't. I think Bolton and Rice could do a great job if given someone rational to work with.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450fcc57\$1@linux...

>

> That's a pathetic answer. Yeah we don't need no stinking diplomats!

Everyone

> else is nuts, crazy and a lunatic. DJ, I thought you had better answers
> than that.

>

> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

> >I think I answered yur question as much as I can by stat8ing that a
diplomat

> >cannot do anything unless there is willingness to participate in a

> >meaningful and sincere dialog.....so keeping in mind that a negotiator

> must

> >have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some sort

> of

> >track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be a

> >credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?

> >

> >

> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f310e\$1@linux...

> >>

> >> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's
world?

> >>

> >>

> >> "justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:

> >> >Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.

> >> >

> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...

> >> >>

> >> >> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?

> >> >>

> >> >> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger in

> >> >> today's

> >> >> world?

> >> >

> >> >

> >> >

> >

> >

>I'd give Winston Churchill a thumbs up. He was an unpleasant guy to be sure, but he was a diplomat.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450ffe32\$1@linux...

>

> Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?Correct me if I'm wrong but isn't he DEAD? Sorry, I meant living today, active and not with a foot in the grave. Thanks ! hehe

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>I'd give Winston Churchill a thumbs up. He was an unpleasant guy to be sure, >but he was a diplomat.

>

>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450ffe32\$1@linux...

>>

>> Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

>

>Hey now: http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-09-19-chirac-interview_x.htm

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>Correct me if I'm wrong but isn't he DEAD? Sorry, I meant living today, active >and not with a foot in the grave. Thanks ! hehe

>

>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>>I'd give Winston Churchill a thumbs up. He was an unpleasant guy to be sure,

>>but he was a diplomat.

>>

>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450ffe32\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

>>

>>

>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

It depends on the definition of diplomacy, of course, so I'd say probably the best diplomat we've had as a president in a while was Bush Sr. When you compare the quality, quantity, and staying power of his coalition in Gulf I to the phony coalition of the bullied and bought for Gulf II it says a lot. I'm no Bush Sr. fan at all, he was a warmongering bastard like every president since at least McKinley, but he was shrewd and rational. I think Colin Powell had a real chance until he got neo-conned. I think he had the

temperment and the fact he was non-white gave him a different sort of credibility than, say, James Baker when he would talk to non-European countries. I think Saudi ambassador prince Bandar was given enviable cards to play (best oil fields in the world) but has managed them impressively considering his country leads the world in beheadings and funding Islamists.

Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even though he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on the European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.

For the US, I'd say nobody has come close to Benjamin Franklin, with John Adams as a second. Adams was able to convince both finance and political bigshots to believe in a country that didn't exist, and to lend us lots of money and a Navy. Franklin did much the same with the French, exquisitely managing a relationship with Talleyrand, another stunningly nimblefooted (or treacherous depending on your opinion) diplomat. And Franklin managed this while being adored by the French and banging lots of hot French aristobabes on the side. So that goes along ways with me.

Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true diplomats and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in the mess we're in now.

TCB http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/business/technology/2003265044_soapbox19.html

http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/business/technology/2003265047_warnertube19.html

http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/business/technology/2003265043_napster19.html

DubzieThis is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_005E_01C6DBE2.C58CF900

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Gene,

I have a stereo pair of Distressors and a Demeter VTCL-2 tube comp. I don't think either of these comps are right for stereo bus work at the mastering level. Is your experience with the UAD Mastering series plugs less=20 fruitful than my hardware options? I really don't want to buy a hardware mastering comp.

Tom

"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message =

news:450ff20f\$1@linux...

"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:

>
>Gene and all others with comments,
>Is the Neve 33609 even worth the bother?
>
>Tom
>

If I didn't have the Portico, I might consider it but I am a glutton. =
I have
many software tools that I have purchased that I use infrequently or =
never,
and if I only bought what I really needed, I would only have a =
fraction of
my current tools. Not bragging

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 17:27:38 GMT

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

or proud of this, I'm just a sucker for =
this
shit. I've heard Paris-only tracks that sound great.
I'm on a ten-step program - Right!
Gene
Actually, the only way to significantly improve the native sound of =
Paris
is with improved converters, hardware and clocking. Plugins always =
seem to
move the sound "laterally" to me. Not up the scale of quality. A few =
exceptions,
yes, but not many. The Paris compressors are a weakness so any good =
plugin
will help, but good hardware is still better.

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?

<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

-----=_NextPart_000_005E_01C6DBE2.C58CF900

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

```

<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Gene,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>I have a stereo pair of Distressors and =
a Demeter=20
VTCL-2</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>tube comp.&nbsp; I don't think either =
of these=20
comps are right</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>for stereo bus work at the mastering =
level.&nbsp;=20
Is your</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>experience with the UAD Mastering =
series plugs less=20
</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>fruitful than </FONT><FONT face=3DArial =
size=3D2>my=20
hardware options?&nbsp; I really don't want to</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>buy a hardware mastering =
comp.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Tom</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE=20
style=3D"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
  <DIV>"gene lennon" &lt;<A=20
  =
href=3D"mailto:glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com">glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com</A>&g=
t;=20
  wrote in message <A=20
  =
href=3D"news:450ff20f$1@linux">news:450ff20f$1@linux</A>...</DIV><BR>"Tom=
Bruhl"=20
  &lt;<A href=3D"mailto:arpeggio@comcast.net">arpeggio@comcast.net</A>&gt; =

  wrote:<BR>&gt;<BR>&gt;Gene and all others with comments,<BR>&gt;Is the =
Neve=20
  33609 even worth the bother?<BR>&gt;<BR>&gt;Tom<BR>&gt;<BR><BR>>If I =
didn't=20
  have the Portico, I might consider it but I am a glutton. I =
have<BR>many=20

```


driver
:)
>
> AA
>
>
> "DJ" <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)
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?

<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

-----=_NextPart_000_008D_01C6DBE3.5AC24CA0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

<HTML><HEAD>

<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">

<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1400" name=3DGENERATOR>

<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>
<DIV>DJ,</DIV>
<DIV>I'm in for the upgrades. =
</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>What happened to the AES box you were =
talking=20
about?</DIV>
<DIV>Tom</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE=20
style=20"PADDING-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; =
BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
 <DIV>"DJ" <<A=20
 =
 href=20"mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net">animix_spam-this-ahole=
 _@animas.net>=20
 wrote in message <A=20
 href=20"news:450f1a7f@linux">news:450f1a7f@linux...</DIV>Do we =
have any=20
 money to pay him? I don't think he's gonna work for=20
 free.

;oP

"Aaron Allen" <<A=20
 =
 href=20"mailto:know-spam@not_here.dude">know-spam@not_here.dude> =
 wrote in=20
 message
<A =
 href=20"news:450e9b9e@linux">news:450e9b9e@linux...
>=20
 Find out if dude is interested in writing a windows Vista and OS-x=20
 driver
.)
>
> AA
>
>
> "DJ" <<A=20
 =
 href=20"mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net">animix_spam-this-ahole=
 _@animas.net>=20
 wrote in message
><A=20
 href=20"news:450e471d\$1@linux">news:450e471d\$1@linux...
> =
> He=20
 wrote the software program that MRI machines are using these =
days.
>=20
 > Very
> > interesting guy. I'm mastering a project for =
his=20
 wife. He was pretty
> > interested in the Paris =
program.=20
 His wife is pretty well known in the LA
> > music community =
and he=20
 digs this stuff. I may ask him if he could write
a
> > =
delay=20

compensation applet for Paris. He really got a chuckle out of
> =
>=20
Frankencomp.....said he's built a few similar monstrosities =
himself.
>=20
> They
> > will be back over here tomorrow night.
>=20
>
> > ;o)
> >
> >
> >
>=20
>
>
>

</BLOCKQUOTE>
<DIV>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, =
and=20
you?
<A=20
href=3D"http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html">http://www.polesoft.com/refer=
..html </DIV></BODY ></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_008D_01C6DBE3.5AC24CA0--The biggest weasel on earth I'd say.

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:45100fe1\$1@linux...

>

> Hey now:

http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-09-19-chirac-intervi ew_x.htm

>

> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:

> >

> >Correct me if I'm wrong but isn't he DEAD? Sorry, I meant living today,

> active

> >and not with a foot in the grave. Thanks ! hehe

> >

> >"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

> >>I'd give Winston Churchill a thumbs up. He was an unpleasant guy to be

> sure,

> >>but he was a diplomat.

> >>

> >>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450ffe32\$1@linux...

> >>>

> >>> Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

> >>

> >>

> >

>Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even
though

he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on the
European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.

I agree that he was aboslutely brilliant.

>Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true
diplomats

and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in
the mess we're in now. <

Well, IMHO, we are faced with what we've got now (and could be improved) or with the return to the Talleyrands of the left and the wet finger in the wind.

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:451010bb\$1@linux...

>

> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:

> >

> >Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

>

> It depends on the definition of diplomacy, of course, so I'd say probably
> the best diplomat we've had as a president in a while was Bush Sr. When
you

> compare the quality, quantity, and staying power of his coalition in Gulf

> I to the phony coalition of the bullied and bought for Gulf II it says a

> lot. I'm no Bush Sr. fan at all, he was a warmongering bastard like every

> president since at least McKinley, but he was shrewd and rational. I think

> Colin Powell had a real chance until he got neo-conned. I think he had the

> temperment and the fact he was non-white gave him a different sort of
credibility

> than, say, James Baker when he would talk to non-European countries. I
think

> Saudi ambassador prince Bandar was given enviable cards to play (best oil

> fields in the world) but has managed them impressively considering his
country

> leads the world in beheadings and funding Islamists.

>

> Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even
though

> he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on
the

> European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.

>

> For the US, I'd say nobody has come close to Benjamin Franklin, with John

> Adams as a second. Adams was able to convince both finance and political

> bigshots to believe in a country that didn't exist, and to lend us lots of

> money and a Navy. Franklin did much the same with the French, exquisitely

> managing a relationship with Talleyrand, another stunningly nimblefooted

> (or treacherous depending on your opinion) diplomat. And Franklin managed

> this while being adored by the French and banging lots of hot French
aristobabes

> on the side. So that goes along ways with me.

>

> Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true
diplomats

> and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in
> the mess we're in now.
>
> TCBWith all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone can
discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into more
of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't want
to read.

Tony

"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa\$1@linux...
>
> for ... many times poeple.
> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>
>
>
> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>>
>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>>
>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>
>>
>>TCB wrote:
>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would
> be
>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point.
>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXXX'
> it's
>>> just not true and XXXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
>>> Probably
>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's
> sort
>>> of about this very topic.

>>>

>>> <http://www.amazon.com/Agains>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 18:10:29 GMT

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

> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,

>>>>> engagement,

>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.

>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,

>>> allegiance,

>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent

>>>>> troubles.

>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made

> through

>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.

>>>>>

>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can

>>> do

>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but

>>> do

>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have

>>>>> faith

>>> but

>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.

>>>>>

>>>>> TCB

>>>>>

>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary

>>>>>> definition.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>>> -Jamie

>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> TCB wrote:

>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals

>>> take

>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have

>>> faith.

>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married,

> etc.

>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.

>>>>>>> Religious
 >>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of "faith."
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will find
 >>> its
 >>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
 > the
 >>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
 > see
 >>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together
 > much
 >>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith people
 >>> would
 >>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
 >>>>>>> other
 >>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride trains,
 >>> fly
 >>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
 >>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot have
 >>>
 >>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or more
 >>>
 >>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
 >>>>>>> stories
 >>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of afterlife.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
 >>>>>>> deities.
 >>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
 >>>>>>> violently,
 >>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even disagree
 >>> about
 >>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
 >>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be
 > a
 >>>
 >>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,
 > you
 >>>>>>> just dissed the majority of religions. No problem because THEY ARE
 >>>
 >>>>>>> WRONG. And people who believe in those religions may just be saying
 >>> the

>>>>>> same thing about you and your religion. For those religions who are
>>> not
>>>>>> tolerant of other ideas, you may just have started a war.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> So perhaps it's BETTER, in our time, to have a system of justice
> that
>>>> is
>>>>>> NOT based on a religion. But one which guarantees everyone the
>>>>>> right
>>>> to
>>>>>> practice the religion of their choice, guarantees other freedoms
> such
>>>> as
>>>>>> we in the USA do in our Bill of Rights, encourages honesty and
>>>>>> integrity, while enforcing some common sense limits such as no
>>>>>> human
>>>>>> sacrifices, a minimum age for marriage, no incest, no slavery, no
>
>>>>>> murder, no rape, no stealing, those sorts of things.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> What is viewed as morality beyond a fair justice system and common
>>> sense
>>>>>> rules of behavior can be left to each freely chosen religion to
>>>>>> sort
>>>>>> out, like whether to restrict diet in some way, whether to wear a
>
>>>>>> certain type of clothing, how to pray, etc. But none of these
>>>>>> additional
>>>>>> practices should be imposed on society as a whole.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The Golden Rule may also be of use as a basic moral foundation.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> So yes, you can have a moral system, one that BTW protects the
>>>>>> freedom
>>>>>> to practice religious beliefs (or not), without basing it on any
> one
>>>>>> religion. And it can protect all religions better than a system
>>>>>> based
>>>> on
>>>>>> any one religion (AKA a theocracy).
>>>>>>
>>>>>> There are other issues surrounding religions, such as the many
>>>>>> examples
>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
>>>>>> hijacked
>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
>>>>>> cases.
>>>>>> Dedic, I look forward to talking with you about the positives and

>>>
>>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought to
>>> go
>>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God - there
>>> are
>>>>>>> tons
>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>>>>>>> itself
>>>>>>> tells
>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong
> sense
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference
> point,
>>>>>>> what
>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use
> to
>>>>> decide
>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so
> with
>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
>>>>>>> since
>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept
> as
>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that has
>>> a
>>>>> proven
>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
>>>>>>> reasoning
>>>>>>> or

>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
>>>>>>> abuse,
>>>>> anger
>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
> experience
>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
> that
>>>>> person
>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of the
>>> whole.
>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing,
> lying,
>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
> can
>>>>> be
>>>>>> means
>>>>>>> of survival.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
>>>>>>> differences
>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
>>>>>>> societies
>>>>>> even
>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into any
>>> form
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
>>>>>>> relationships,
>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
>>>>>>> aren't
>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to
> make
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>>>>>>> only
>>>>> be
>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>>>>>>> time,
>>>>> and
>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
>>> to
>>>>> person,
>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would

>>>>>>> either
 >>>>>> be
 >>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
 >>>>>>> because
 >>>>>>> their
 >>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
 >>>>>>> wouldn't
 >>>>> have
 >>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
 >>> no
 >>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences
 > of
 >>>>> either,
 >>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
 >>>>>>> consequence
 >>>>>>> - it
 >>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
 >>> in
 >>>>> whether
 >>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
 > With
 >>>>>>> moral
 >>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
 > drastically
 >>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
 > reasoning
 >>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
 >>> when
 >>>>>>> we
 >>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
 >>>>>>> option
 >>>>>>> to
 >>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
 > no
 >>> power
 >>>>>>> in
 >>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
 >>> loving
 >>>>>>> God
 >>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God

> in
>>> the
>>>>>> way
>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>>>>>>> discuss
>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>>>>>> insulting,
>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>>>>>>> concept;
>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
>>> greed
>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>> Dedic
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
> strong
>>>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "Dedic Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
>>>>>>>>> response
>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
>>> even
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
>>>>>>>>> violence
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
>>>>>>>>> largest
>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We
> ignore
>>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of

>>>>>>>>> tortured
>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
>>> Pope
>>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>>>> religion
>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>>>>>>>>> Muslims
>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
> in
>>> many
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>>>>>>>>> talked
>>>>> to,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>>>>>>>>> different
>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
> here.
>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At
> best,
>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
>>> own
>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
>>> kind
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
>>> thing
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> do.

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
> and
>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice
>>> to
>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
> of
>>> Allah
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>>>>> in
>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
> is
>>> a
>>>>> sad,
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>> -
>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
>>> whims
>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
> That
>>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God
>>> and
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false
>>>>>>>>>> hope
>>>>> as
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
>>> then
>>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>>>>>>>>>> should
>>>>>>> be
>>&g

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [Sarah](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 19:03:45 GMT

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

t;>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>>> President
>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>>>>>>> really
>>>>>> better
>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>>>>>>> accompanies
>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
>>>>>>> point
>>>> for
>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
>>> in
>>>> any
>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
>>> others?
>>>>>>>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [rick](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 19:50:21 GMT

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

;>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy
> Islam
>>>>>>> doesn't
>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
>>> this
>>>>>> forum
>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
>>>>>>> intent
>>>> to
>>>>>> take
>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
>>> is
>>>> to
>>>>>> give
>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
> not
>>>> believe
>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
> public
>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from public

>>> in
 >>>>>> a
 >>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is
 > to
 >>>> outlaw
 >>>>>>>> it.
 >>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the
 > world
 >>>>>> as a
 >>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
 >>>>>>>> always
 >>>> wins
 >>>>>>>> and
 >>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
 >>>>>>>> validity
 >>>>>> in
 >>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to maintain
 >>> the
 >>>>>>>> balance
 >>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust in
 >>> the
 >>>>>> very
 >>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most fallible
 >>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
 >>>>>>>> ideology.
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10
 > hours
 >>>>>> of
 >>>>>>>> work
 >>>>>>>> :-(....
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>> Regards,
 >>>>>>>> Dedric
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
 >>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
 >>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
 > -...
 >>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
 >>>>>>>>>> current
 >>>>>>>>>> administration

>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
>>>>>>>>>> reasons
>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
>>>>>>>>>> Great
>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing
> as
>>>>> he
>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
>>>>>>>>>> against
>>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war that
>>> he
>>>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit of
>>> trouble
>>>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
>>>>>>>>>> headed?
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
>>>>>>>>>> easily
>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201>
>>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> `
>>>>
>>>>
>I know this will probably be met with a lot of "you-oughta try's" but I have

been using 1x12's exclusively for 21 years. Moreover, loaded with EV 12-L Series II spkr. Rated @ 300w, most players would run, not walk, from these for distortion of any kind. And while I can't really tell you how or why I decided that these were my best option, they remain just that. Next to a good FOH eng, these are the most significant components in my signal path. I've never looked back. Maybe because my 1x12's were custom built and based on an old Pacific (Michael Forest) design and employ high grade, slow growth, light-but-dense Norwegian fir. I use just one primarily but when the stage is big enough and the players be fine, I switch the old 50/50 to stereo and run the twin cabs about 20' apart, 10' away, pointing back, up and and slightly in and jump feet first into what one of my gig compadres calls "one big luxurious stereo sonic bathtub."

W.

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
news:450a08d7@linux...

- > I'm looking at picking up a 4x12 to club gig with. Anybody got experience
- > to share with me about these models??
- > Is there 'really' a \$1000 dollars worth of difference in tone from bottom
- > to top with them, is it mechanics (like say, casters and handles)?
- > I will be driving it with a 60wpc tube amp with a tube preamp front end.
- > I want the elusive 'brown sound' distortion and super clear cleans...
- > which the amp/preamp combo is certainly capable of giving me. It's the
- > cabs that suck on my current gear (2 unmatched 2x12's) - I wish to move to
- > one stereo matched cab, and I'm not afraid to rewire it if that matters.
- > Many thanks in advance!
- >
- >
- > <https://www.zzounds.com/item--MSHMG412A>
- > \$450.00 \$279.95
- > Angled-front version.
- > Power: 120 watts
- > Impedance: 8 ohms
- > Speakers: 4 x 12 in. Marshall/Celestion custom-designed speakers (30W
- > each)
- > Dimensions (W x H x D): 26.4 x 26.4 x 14.0 in.
- >
- >
- > <http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960A>
- > \$1,150.00 \$649.95
- > Angled-front version.
- > Black grille cloth
- > White piping
- > Black elephant grain vinyl
- > Speaker: 4 x 12 in. G12T-75
- > Power: 300 watt
- > Impedance: 4 or 16 ohms mono/8 ohms stereo

> Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360mm
 > Weight: 36.4 kg
 >
 >
 > <http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AX>
 > \$1,500.00 \$1,049.00
 > Angled front
 > Vintage-circa early 70's
 > Checkered cloth
 > White piping
 > Medium size white logo
 > Black Levant vinyl
 > Gold beading on Cab
 > Speakers: 4 Celestion G12 M-25w SPKR-00016
 > Power: 100 watts
 > Impedance: 16 ohm
 > Dimensions: 760 x 830 x 360 mm
 > Weight: 37.7 kg
 > Cover: COVR-00022 optional
 >
 >
 > <http://www.zzounds.com/item--MSH1960AHW>
 > \$1,800.00 \$1,200.00
 > Loaded with Celestion G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
 > To complement the 1959HW's visual and sonic majesty, Marshall offers the
 > 1960AHW (angled) 4x12 cabinet. It boasts basket weave fret cloth, metal
 > handles, "100" logos, and is loaded with Celestion's highly-acclaimed
 > G12H-30 re-issue speakers.
 >
 >
 >and you're pick is?"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
 >
 >"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
 >>
 >
 >>Are you unable to criticize Muslims? Have you drunken the liberal
 >>kool-aid?
 >>
 >>expiring minds want to know!
 >>
 >>DC
 >>
 >
 >I posted the link about Becky Fischer for a specific reason. It was not
 to
 >embarrass or criticize any true believers, but to point out that some extremists
 >exist on the Christian side. My Point?
 >

>It is unfair to paint the modern Christian movement with the brush of Becky
>Fischer, or Fred Phelps. The Christian movement may have a few extremists,
>but they do not represent the majority of good people following the Christian
>cause. Funny, because that is the exact point I am also trying to make about
>the modern Moslem movement, which is not just a bunch of knife wielding
maniacs.

>It is largely a mixture of fundamentalists combined with many who want to
>see more progressive reform in the Moslem church.

>

>Of the over one billion Moslems in the world today perhaps 1% are extremist

only

>takes one with a WMD to cause great harm. But what about the 99%?

>

>I am still waiting for someone to answer my question about what we should
>do if we suffer a major attack and a Moslem extremist group takes credit.

>

>Should we kill 1,000,000 people? How about 1,000,000,000?

>

>I do condemn Moslem radical violence . Killing a Nun because of what the
>Pope said is unconscionable but it is not all Moslems.

>

>P.S. Please point out my lies. I may be delusional, but I think I am trying
>to bring some balance to a very one-sided and highly charged issue.

>

>

>Gene

>

>

>

>

>

There are moslem countries that harbor moslem terrorist. Some of the moslem
governments support these terrorist financially. Some of the same people
that are in the moslem government are also members of the terrorist organizations.

There is no separation of religion and government. Their religious leaders
control their government. These religious leaders call for the destruction
of the United States.

Who do we bomb? We bomb the moslem countries that are behind the terrorist
attacks! Although conventional bombing will not stop the problems.

They try to build nukes, we take them out before they take us out. They have
made their intentions clear! We need to take out the nuclear facilities
in Iran. If we have to go to war, will innocent people be killed? YES! That's
war. We didn't start it they did!

The first thing I would do in the name of peace, would be to stop supporting

Israel. But I don't think you would like that, would you? Last year we caught Israeli spies in Washington spying on our government. Why should we keep supporting them??? How does Israel help the US? Allies, did they help us fight the Korean war, Vietnam war, gulf war, any war??? We hand them money hand over fist, billions a year, why? You all know why!

You want to fix it? We need to stop supporting Oh Israel. They got the nukes already, god will protect Israel, they don't need us. We need to butt out!

Although, I'm not sure that it would stop the moslem terrorist from their mission of destroying the US. They are hell bent on this. How many times have they had peace agreements only to turnaround and break cease fires? There will never be peace with moslems. They are not peaceful people, just look at what they are doing, they kill their own. It is going to take something vary serious to stop all of this and it's not going to be talk.Ted Kennedy

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message news:45101602@linux...

> Historically, in the west, I'd say Metternich has to take the cake even
> though

> he believed everything I despise. Austria by rights was a bit player on
the

> European stage but their chief diplomat remade most of Europe.

>

> I agree that he was aboslutely brilliant.

>

> >Just my ideas off the top of my head. The US has been starved for true
> diplomats

> and strategic thinkers for some time. That's part of the reason we're in
> the mess we're in now. <

>

> Well, IMHO, we are faced with what we've got now (and could be improved)
or

> with the return to the Talleyrands of the left and the wet finger in the
> wind.

>

>

>

> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:451010bb\$1@linux...

> >

> > "John" <no@no.com> wrote:

> > >

> > >Ok, so who do you consider to be a great diplomats period?

> >

> > It depends on the definition of diplomacy, of course, so I'd say
probably

> > the best diplomat we've had as a president in a while was Bush Sr. When

> you
> > compare the quality, quantity, and staying power of his coalition in Gulf
> > I to the phony coalition of the bullied and bought for Gulf II it says a
> > lot. I'm no Bush Sr. fan at all, he was a warmongering bastard like
every
> > president since at least McKinley, but he was shrewd and rational. I
think
> > Colin Powell had a real chance until he got neo-conned. I think he had
the
> > temperament and the fact he was non-white gave him a different sort of
> credibility
> > than, say, James Baker when he would talk to non-European countries. I
> think
> > Saudi ambassador prince Bandar was given enviable cards to play (best
oil
> > fields in the world) but has manage

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 22:16:18 GMT

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

nk">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 of 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

> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>
> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>
>
> DJ wrote:
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f3862@linux...
> >> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature
of
> >> the threat.
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> >> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
> >> before the 9/11 attack.
> >>
> >> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terrorism
> >>
> >> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
> >> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
> >> preemptive attack policy. :^)
> >
> > I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has always
been
> > the *clear and present danger* prerogative but it needs to be based on
> > 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 trun around and blame Bush for the
decisions
> > made based on the intellegence 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...
> >>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
> > it's
> >>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others
> > do
> >>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
> > well,
> >>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
> >>>>
> >>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money
> > and
> >>>> convince others to actually see us as evil

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 22:26:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>> Islam. So
> >>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>&

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 23:05:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> > 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 would have
 been
 > >>> an
 > >>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
 > >>>>>>
 > >>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
 > >>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
 hung
 > > on
 > >>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
 universe
 > >>>> while
 > >>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes
 the
 > >>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
 > >>>>>>
 > >>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
 > >>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
 > >>> about
 > >>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
 > > clever
 > >>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
 > > ago,

> >>>>> and
> >>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches
> > who,
> >>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
> > evidence
> >>>>> of
> >>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing,
and
> >>> who
> >>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
> >>> bucks
> >>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who
push
> >>> to
> >>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
> > our
> >>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
> > sometimes
> >>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
> > to
> >>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
> >>>>> spreading
> >>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
> > power.
> >>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and
the
> >>>>> focus
> >>>>>>> on the use of force.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
> > victory.
> >>>>> ;^)
> >>>>>>> Have a great week!
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> DC wrote:
> >>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading 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

> >>>>>>> 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

Benedict

> >>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
humanists
> >>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

> >>>>>>> genius. He has clearly laid out the differences between
> >>>>>>> Christian culture and Islamic culture and the basis of the clash
> >>>>>>> of civilizations we now experience as the War on Terror. His
> >>>>>>> analysis also explains the underlying cause of the alliance
> >>>>>>> between the western Left and the Islamofascist Right.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Islamist reaction focuses on one sentence in the speech.
> >>>>>>>&g

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [macle](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 23:16:00 GMT

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

t; Reaching back to 1391, Benedict quotes Byzantine Emperor Manuel

> >>>>>>> you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> unanimously condemned Pope Benedict XVI. Lebanon's top Shiite
> >>>>>>> cleric demanded an apology. And in Turkey, the ruling party
> >>>>>>> likened the pontiff to Hitler and Mussolini and accused him of
> >>>>>>> reviving the mentality of the Crusades.
> >>>>>>>

and

> >>>>>>> jihad in a speech in Germany unleashed a torrent of rage that
> >>>>>>> many fear could burst into violent protests like those that

> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Reuters quoted othe

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 23:31:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> >>>>>>> safety and even fear of an attack on Vatican City.
> >>>>>>>

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

> >>>>>>> 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

> >>>>>>> anything. (This explains the predilection on the part of some

to

> >>>>>>> their non-existent morality. They are asserting the only

> >>>>>>>

> >>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
than

> >>>>>>>

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 00:19:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>

> >>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

> >>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 01:42:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

;>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

or

great

> >>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

> >>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.

> >>>>>>>>

> >>>

> >

> >Ok, fair enough. I'm just looking for some diplomacy success stories of recent.

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>OK John.....are you going to send a diplomat to talk to himself? I agree

>it's pathetic but in irder for diplomacy to happen, there has to be more

>than one diplomat. You want me to name a few.....I can't. I think Bolton

>and Rice could do a great job if given someone rational to work with.

>

>

>"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450fcc57\$1@linux...

>>

>> That's a pathetic answer. Yeah we don't need no stinking diplomats!

>Everyone

>> else is nuts, crazy and a lunatic. DJ, I thought you had better answers

>> than that.

>>

>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>> >I think I answered yur question as much as I can by stat8ing that a

>> diplomat

>> >cannot do anything unless there is willingness to participate in a

>> >meaningful and sincere dialog.....so keeping in mind that a negotiator

>> must

>> >have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some
sort

>> of

>> >track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be
a

>> >credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?

>> >

>> >

>> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f310e\$1@linux...

>> >>
>> >> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's
>world?
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> "justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:
>> >> >Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say lately.
>> >> >
>> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger
in
>> >> >> today's
>> >> >> world?
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>"gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I assume we all think that schools in the Middle East where children
are
>>>>indoctrinated with anti-western ideas mixed with big dose of religious
>>zeal
>right?
>>>>
>>>>Gene
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Right.
>>>>
>>>>http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=co1_9IR9EpM

>>

>>It's a twisting of the truth! The children are not being taut to kill people,

>>they are being taught to be an army for Christ, to spread the word of god.

>> The terms they are using like soldiers, are a figure of speech. It should
>>be soul-diers

>>

>>Of corse they would inter view an anti Christian to get their twisted take
>>on it. I know your on the left coast, but come on Gene!

>>

>

>So you are OK with what Becky Fischer is doing?

>Before you answer, here is another quote from her that has been recorded
>by the press with her permission.

>"I want to teach kids that there is no greater way to show their love for
>Jesus then to lay down their lives for the gospel".

>Nice. Soul-diers indeed.

>name is not murder) seem to be misplaced at the Kids On Fire Camp.

>

>How about Fred Phelps, or some of the Christian/Skinheads, or abortion bombers?

>Are you completely unwilling to admit that there are some extremists in
the

>Christian movement?

>

>Gene

>

Gene, there are many that use the name of Christ for their own evil purposes.

There are many radical people that call themselves Christians. I don't know who these people are, that you point out. In Christianity, it is a figure of speech to say lay down your life for Christ. It means to devote your life to christ and to teach the gospel to everybody, not to go out and kill people in Christ's name. This is a misinterpretation.

In the ten commandments it says, "Thou shalt not do murder", so I don't know what you are talking about when you say a second commandment. The second commandment is to not build false idols and worship them. More misinterpretation.i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i wasn't going to enter this fray...

On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
<tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:

>With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone can
>discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into more
>of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee

>house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't want
>to read.
>
>Tony
>
>
>"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa\$1@linux...
>>
>> for ... many times poeple.
>> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
>> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>>
>>
>>
>> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>>>
>>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>>>
>>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>
>>>
>>>TCB wrote:
>>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would
>> be
>>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important point.
>>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXXX'
>> it's
>>>> just not true and XXXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
>>>> Probably
>>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's
>> sort
>>>> of about this very topic.
>>>>
>>>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29_81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>

>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just
>> as
>>>>>
>>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>>>>
>>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out. Some
>>
>>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like that.
>>>>>
>>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
>>>>> something
>>>>>
>>>>> for some other reason, of course.
>>>>>
>>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the
>>
>>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>>>> problem with that.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>>>
>>>>>> faith  /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
>>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
>>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
>>>>>> -noun
>>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
>>>>>> ability.
>>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the hypothesis
>>>> would
>>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
>>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
>>>>>> firm
>>>> faith
>>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
>>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit, etc.:
>>>> to
>>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
>>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
>>>>>> faith.
>>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
>>>>>> engagement,

>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise, oath,
>>>> allegiance,
>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
>>>>> troubles.
>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
>> through
>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
>>>>>
>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people can
>>>> do
>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail, but
>>>> do
>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
>>>>> faith
>>>> but
>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
>>>>>> definition.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.' Animals
>>>> take
>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they have
>>>> faith.
>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married,
>> etc.
>>>

Subject: Re: photo fraud
Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 02:46:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

next get together.
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> No doubt o

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 03:06:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gt; relationships,
>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
>>>>>>>> aren't
>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to
>> make
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>>>>>>>> only
>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>>>>>>>> time,
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from person
>>>> to
>>>>>>>> person,
>>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>>>>>>>> either
>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>>>>>>>> because
>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>>>>>>>> wouldn't
>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there were
>>>> no
>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences
>> of
>>>>>>>> either,
>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad

>>>>>>>> consequence
>>>>>>>> - it
>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice, both
>>>> in
>>>>> whether
>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
>> With
>>>>>>>> moral
>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
>> drastically
>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
>> reasoning
>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry. Even
>>>> when
>>>>>>>> we
>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
>>>>>>>> option
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
>> no
>>>> power
>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal and
>>>> loving
>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
>> in
>>>> the
>>>>>>>> way
>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>>>>>>>> discuss
>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>>>>>>> insulting,
>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>>>>>>>> concept;
>>>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely trump
>>>> greed
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this planet.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
>> strong
>>>>>>>> morals
>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>>> Gene -
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
>>>>>>>> response
>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country and
>>>> even
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
>>>>>>>> violence
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
>>>>>>>> largest
>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We
>> ignore
>>>>>>> car
>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
>>>>>>>> tortured
>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made the
>>>> Pope
>>>>>>> quote
>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>>>>> religion
>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>>>>>>>> Muslims
>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
>> in
>>>> many

>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> conservative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>>>>>>>>> talked
>>>>> to,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>>>>>>>>> different
>>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
>> here.
>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At
>> best,
>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on our
>>>> own
>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to this
>>>> kind
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically correct
>>>> thing
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
>> and
>>>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the choice
>>>> to
>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
>> of
>>>> Allah
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
>> is

>>>> a
>>>>> sad,
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>> -
>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's personal
>>>> whims
>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
>> That
>>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in God
>>>> and
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
>>>>>>>>> hope
>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is wrong,
>>>> then
>>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>>>>>>>>> should
>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that the
>>>> President
>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>>>>>>>>> really
>>>>>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>>>>>>>>> accompanies
>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
>>>>>>>>> point
>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of belief
>>>> in
>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion for
>>>> others?
>>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy
>> Islam
>>>>>>>>> doesn't

>>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do on
>>>> this
>>>>>>> forum
>>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
>>>>>>>>> intent
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>> take
>>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only goal
>>>> is
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
>> not
>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
>> public
>>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>> The only wa

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 10:02:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

oing?
>>Before you answer, here is another quote from her that has been recorded
>>by the press with her permission.
>>"I want to teach kids that there is no greater way to show their love for
>>Jesus then to lay down their lives for the gospel".
>>Nice. Soul-diers indeed.

>>name is not murder) seem to be misplaced at the Kids On Fire Camp.
>>
>>How about Fred Phelps, or some of the Christian/Skinheads, or abortion bombers?
>>Are you completely unwilling to admit that there are some extremists in
>the
>>Christian movement?

>>
>>Gene
>>
>
>Gene, there are many that use the name of Christ for their own evil purposes.
> There are many radical people that call themselves Christians. I don't
>know who these people are, that you point out. In Christianity, it is a
>figure of speech to say lay down your life for Christ. It means to devote
>your life to christ and to teach the gospel to everybody, not to go out and
>kill people in Christ's name. This is a misinterpretation.

>
>In the ten commandments it says, "Thou shalt not do murder", so I don't know
>what you are talking about when you say a second commandment. The second
>commandment is to not build false idols and worship them. More misinterpretation."Tom Bruhl"
<arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:
>
>
>Gene,
>I have a stereo pair of Distressors and a Demeter VTCL-2
>tube comp. I don't think either of these comps are right
>for stereo bus work at the mastering level. Is your
>experience with the UAD Mastering series plugs less=20
>fruitful than my hardware options? I really don't want to
>buy a hardware mastering comp.
>Tom
>

if I am sending demos out or occasionally for film work. I do not consider myself a Mastering Engineer (capitalized), even though I do have a few mastering credits. For real album work I send tracks to professional mastering people.

real mastering.

If I did not have the Portico, I would probably pick the UAD 33609 over the UAD Mastering Compressor simply because I have a slight preference for the

The best thing is to try the demos yourself. I do agree that the Distressor

Demeter.

Sony Dynamics and Limiter

The optional limiter for SawStudio (I forget the name)

UAD Fairchild (for effect only)

A step down but usable are:

PSP MasterComp, Voxengo, and Roger Nichols Finis

Genel'm sensing some sarcasm there Rick. ;>) I would make a terrible diplomat. I react far too much from the gut. Beside, it's hard to be a good communicator with your foot in your mouth!

I didn't mean to sound harsh to ulfiyya. He (she?) has every right to want this group to stick to PARIS related stuff. I guess it just feels more like a community to me than a technical reference source.

Tony

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:k0c0h2hl6cc83qvha4esc96935fo3nqtb1@4ax.com...
>i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
> wasn't going to enter this fray...
>
> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>
>>With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
>>can
>>discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
>>more
>>of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
>>house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't want
>>to read.
>>
>>Tony
>>
>>
>>"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> for ... many times poeple.
>>> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
>>> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
>>>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
>>>>
>>>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
>>>>
>>>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
>>>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
>>>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
>>>>lasting and beneficial peace.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>TCB wrote:

>>>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that would
>>> be
>>>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important
>>>>> point.
>>>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXX'
>>> it's
>>>>> just not true and XXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.
>>>>> Probably
>>>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and it's
>>> sort
>>>>> of about this very topic.
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-29_81628?ie=UTF8&s=books
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although just
>>> as
>>>>>
>>>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out.
>>>>>> Some
>>>
>>>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like
>>>>>> that.
>>>>>
>>>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
>>>>>> something
>>>>>
>>>>>> for some other reason, of course.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of the
>>>
>>>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
>>>>>> problem with that.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> faith  /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled

>>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
 >>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
 >>>>>> -noun
 >>>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
 >>>>>> ability.
 >>>>>> 2. belief that is not based on proof: He had faith that the
 >>>>>> hypothesis
 >>>>> would
 >>>>>> be substantiated by fact.
 >>>>>> 3. belief in God or in the doctrines or teachings of religion: the
 >>>>>> firm
 >>>>> faith
 >>>>>> of the Pilgrims.
 >>>>>> 4. belief in anything, as a code of ethics, standards of merit,
 >>>>>> etc.:
 >>>>> to
 >>>>>> be of the same faith with someone concerning honesty.
 >>>>>> 5. a system of religious belief: the Christian faith; the Jewish
 >>>>>> faith.
 >>>>>> 6. the obligation of loyalty or fidelity to a person, promise,
 >>>>>> engagement,
 >>>>>> etc.: Failure to appear would be breaking faith.
 >>>>>> 7. the observance of this obligation; fidelity to one's promise,
 >>>>>> oath,
 >>>>> allegiance,
 >>>>>> etc.: He was the only one who proved his faith during our recent
 >>>>>> troubles.
 >>>>>> 8. Christian Theology. the trust in God and in His promises as made
 >>> through
 >>>>>> Christ and the Scriptures by which humans are justified or saved.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> I don't see anything in there about risk. My point is that people
 >>>>>> can
 >>>>> do
 >>>>>> the things you're talking about knowing full well they might fail,
 >>>>>> but
 >>>>> do
 >>>>>> them anyway. That's taking a risk, not having faith. I don't have
 >>>>>> faith
 >>>>> but
 >>>>>> I've taken lots of personal and professional risks in my life.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> TCB
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
 >>>>>>> We can disagree about that but the first line is the dictionary
 >>>>>>> definition.
 >>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>> You're confusing 'faith' with 'a willingness to take risks.'
>>>>>>> Animals
>>>>> take
>>>>>>> risks, to get food, create more animals, etc., but I doubt they
>>>>>>> have
>>>>> faith.
>>>>>>> One needs no faith to start businesses, invest money, get married,
>>> etc.
>>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> Faith is complete trust or confidence in something or someone.
>>>>>>>> Religious
>>>>>>>> faith is one form of faith but not the only definition of
>>>>>>>> "faith."
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> For example I have faith that if I drop a guitar pick it will
>>>>>>>> find
>>>>> its
>>>>>>>> way to the floor based on the gravitational attraction it has to
>>> the
>>>>>>>> planet. I have faith that I'll breathe my next breath, that I'll
>>> see
>>>>>>>> tomorrow morning. I have faith that other people are put together
>>> much
>>>>>>>> like I am and that I can therefore relate to other folks.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Without faith, people would not invest money. Without faith
>>>>>>>> people
>>>>> would
>>>>>>>> not vote. Without faith people would not start businesses, hire
>>>>>>>> other
>>>>>>>> people, raise children. Without faith people would not ride
>>>>>>>> trains,
>>>>> fly
>>>>>>>> in planes or drive cars. Without faith no one would investigate
>>>>>>>> scientific questions about reality.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> While you can clearly have faith without religion, you cannot
>>>>>>>> have
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> religion without faith. Religion depends on faith that one or
>>>>>>>> more
>>>>>

>>>>>>>> deities (good and sometimes bad) exist, that their associated
>>>>>>>> stories
>>>>>>>> actually occurred, and often, that there is some sort of
>>>>>>>> afterlife.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> However, religious people believe in a variety of different
>>>>>>>> deities.
>>>>>>>> Even those who believe in the same deity disagree, sometimes
>>>>>>>> violently,
>>>>>>>> about the nature of their deity. Religions sometimes even
>>>>>>>> disagree
>>>> about
>>>>>>>> the nature of reality. If you want to base morality strictly on
>>>>>>>> religion, and you look around, you'll notice that religion can be
>>> a
>>>>
>>>>>>>> somewhat chaotic basis unless...
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Ah, you might say, I want to base morality on MY religion. Well,
>>> you
>>&g

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 15:09:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

arget="_blank">http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God -
>>>>>>>> there
>>>> are
>>>>>>>> tons
>>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>>>>>>>> itself
>>>>>>>> tells
>>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a strong
>>> sense
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher reference
>>> point,
>>>>>>>> what

>>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one use
 >>> to
 >>>>>>>>> decide
 >>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now, so
 >>> with
 >>>>>>>>> no
 >>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
 >>>>>>>>> since
 >>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to accept
 >>> as
 >>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that
 >>>>>>>>> has
 >>>>> a
 >>>>>>> proven
 >>>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
 >>>>>>>>> reasoning
 >>>>>>>>> or
 >>>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
 >>>>>>>>> abuse,
 >>>>>>>>> anger
 >>>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide whose
 >>> experience
 >>>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
 >>> that
 >>>>>>>>> person
 >>>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of
 >>>>>>>>> the
 >>>>>>>>> whole.
 >>>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then stealing,
 >>> lying,
 >>>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
 >>> can
 >>>>>>>>> be
 >>>>>>>>> means
 >>>>>>>>> of survival.
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
 >>>>>>>>> differences
 >>>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
 >>>>>>>>> societies

>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into
>>>>>>> any
>>>> form
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
>>>>>>> relationships,
>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
>>>>>>> aren't
>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes to
>>> make
>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>>>>>>> only
>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>>>>>>> time,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from
>>>>>>> person
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>> person,
>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>>>>>>> either
>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>>>>>>> because
>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>>>>>>> wouldn't
>>>>>>> have
>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there
>>>>>>>&

Subject: Re: church and state
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 15:35:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gt;>>> were
>>>>>>> no
>>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no consequences
>>> of
>>>>>>> either,
>>>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
>>>>>>>>> consequence
>>>>>>>> - it
>>>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice,
>>>>>>>>> both
>>>>> in
>>>>>>> whether
>>>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
>>> With
>>>>>>>> moral
>>>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
>>> drastically
>>>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency in
>>> reasoning
>>>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry.
>>>>>>>>> Even
>>>>> when
>>>>>>>> we
>>>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
>>>>>>>>> option
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
>>> no
>>>>> power
>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>> loving
>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
>>> in
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> way
>>>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>>>>>>>>> discuss
>>>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>>>>>>>>> insulting,
>>>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>>>>>>>>> concept;
>>>>>>>>> and 2)
>>>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely

>>>>>>>>> trump
 >>>>> greed
 >>>>>>>> and
 >>>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this
 >>>>>>>>> planet.
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> Regards,
 >>>>>>>>> Dedric
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
 >>>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
 >>> strong
 >>>>>>>>> morals
 >>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
 >>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
 >>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
 >>>>>>>>>>> news:C1325038.358D%dterry@keyofd.net...
 >>>>>>>>>>> Gene -
 >>>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>>> You probably didn't realize it (so no offense), but your
 >>>>>>>>>>>>> response
 >>>>>>> pretty
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>> much confirms my assertion that the tendency of our country
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>> and
 >>>>> even
 >>>>>>>>> the
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>> world society, is to place blame for religious conflict,
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>> violence
 >>>>>>>>>> and
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> religiously motivated terrorism anywhere but with the single
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> largest
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> growing, and currently most violent religion in the world. We
 >>> ignore
 >>>>>>>>>>> car
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> bombings, suicide bombers, torched churches, thousands of
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> tortured
 >>>>>>>>>>> and
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> murdered, exiled and ostracized people in favor of blaming the
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration for anything and everything, as if Bush made
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the
 >>>>> Pope
 >>>>>>>>>>> quote
 >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> a

>>>>>>>>>> Byzantine emperor by going to war in Iraq.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Islam isn't the passive, peaceful, non-threatening,
>>>>>>>>>> all-accepting
>>>>>>> religion
>>>>>>>>>> our country seems to blindly want to believe. Some western
>>>>>>>>>> Muslims
>>>>>>>> might
>>>>>>>>>> be, but just ask anyone who tried to believe in anything else
>>> in
>>>>> many
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> conserv

Subject: Re: church and state one more thing...
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 15:43:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ative Islamic countries of the world. I know, have
>>>>>>>>>> talked
>>>>>>> to,
>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>>>>>>>>>> different
>>>>>>>> world
>>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
>>> here.
>>>>>>>>>> People
>>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do. At
>>> best,
>>>>>>>> their
>>>>>>>&

Subject: Re: church and state
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 15:54:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gt;>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>>>>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on
>>>>>>>>>>>> our

>>>>> own
>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
>>>>>>>>>> this
>>>>> kind
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
>>>>>>>>>> correct
>>>>> thing
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
>>> and
>>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
>>>>>>>>>> choice
>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
>>> of
>>>>> Allah
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
>>> is
>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> sad,
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>>>>>>> -
>>>>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
>>>>>>>>>>>> personal
>>>>> whims
>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
>>> That
>>>>>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> God

>>>>> and
 >>>>>>> is
 >>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false
 >>>>>>>>> hope
 >>>>>> as
 >>>>>>> a
 >>>>>>>>> sense
 >>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is
 >>>>>>>>> wrong,
 >>>>> then
 >>>>>>> at
 >>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
 >>>>>>>>> should
 >>>>>>> be
 >>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that
 >>>>>>>>> the
 >>>>> President
 >>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
 >>>>>>>>> really
 >>>>>>>>> better
 >>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
 >>>>>>>>> accompanies
 >>>>>>>>> disbelief
 >>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
 >>>>>>>>> point
 >>>>>> for
 >>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of
 >>>>>>>>> belief
 >>>>> in
 >>>>>> any
 >>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion
 >>>>>>>>> for
 >>>>> others?
 >>>>>>>>> It isn't the administration's fault that the Pope quoted a guy
 >>> Islam
 >>>>>>>>> doesn't
 >>>>>>>>> like just because he called like he saw it - something we do
 >>>>>>>>> on
 >>>>> this
 >>>>>>>>> forum
 >>>>>>>>> every single day, ironically. It also isn't Christianity's
 >>>>>>>>> intent
 >>>>>> to
 >>>>>>>>> take
 >>>>>>>>> over the world, or the government. Far from it. The only
 >>>>>>>>> goal
 >>>>> is
 >>>>>> to

>>>>>>> give
>>>>>>>>> people a chance to decide. Yet, those that want to decide to
>>> not
>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>> would rather take that right away and remove Christianity from
>>> public
>>>>>>>>> view.
>>>>>>>>> The only way to force someone to remove their belief from
>>>>>>>>> public
>>>> in
>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>> country that promotes the freedom to believe as one wishes, is
>>> to
>>>>>>> outlaw
>>>>>>>>> it.
>>>>>>>>> Yet another paradox.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Through our short sighted political glasses we want to see the
>>> world
>>>>>>> as a
>>>>>>>>> black and white, free-will, partisan vote where one's party
>>>>>>>>> always
>>>>>> wins
>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>> the decisions are always in our favor, but fail to see any
>>>>>>>>> validity
>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>> believing a God that gave us the very moral compass to
>>>>>>>>> maintain
>>>> the
>>>>>>>>> balance
>>>>>>>>> that kind of choice affords us. In essence we put our trust
>>>>>>>>> in
>>>> the
>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most
>>>>>>>>> fallible
>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
>>>>>>>>> ideology.
>>>>>>>>>
>&

Subject: Re: church and state
Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 16:08:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

;>>>>

>> >have credibility and those for whom he is negotiating must have some
>> >sort
>> of
>> >track record of credibility, I ask you.....who do you think would be a
>> >credible negotiator for Iran, North Korea, Syria?
>> >
>> >
>> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f310e\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> What? It's a simple question. Who is a real diplomat in today's
> world?
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> "justcron" <parisnews@hydrorecords.com> wrote:
>> >> >Dunno, but jump into your next point cuz he's had a lot to say
>> >> >lately.
>> >> >
>> >> >"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:450f2399\$1@linux...
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Anyone, anyone? Beuller?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> So who would you consider to be equal to or better than Kissinger
>> >> >> in
>> >> >> today's
>> >> >> world?
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>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 of 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
>> resort and I don't believe they were satisfied it was done as such.
>>
>> Preemptive invasion is new as part of the "Bush (Jr.) Doctrine."

>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:450f3862@linux...
>>>> Neither, actually. And what we ought to do would depend on the nature
> of
>>>> the threat.
>>> Agreed.
>>>
>>>> We might want to start with recommendations published in 1999, well
>>>> before the 9/11 attack.
>>>>
>>>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terrorism
>>>>
>>>> We can disagree about whether our current policy is one of overreacting
>>>> or not. We can probably really disagree about the newly minted
>>>> preemptive attack policy. :^)
>>> I don't think there is any newly minted attack policy. There has always
> been
>>> the *clear and present danger* prerogative but it needs to be based on
>>> 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 trun around and blame Bush for the
> decisions
>>> made based on the intellegence 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:

Subject: Re: church and state
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 16:19:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

@linux..." target="_blank">450f0b12@linux...
>>>>> Of course they came out with a blustery ultimatum. That's not news,
>>> it's
>>>>> an old pattern. It works for them to sit back and suggest that others
>>> do
>>>>> something via terror-grams such as this. If it makes you afraid as
>>> well,
>>>>> my guess is they would see that as a bonus.
>>>>>
>>>>> By goading the USA into overreacting it helps them grow, raise money
>>> and
>>>>> convince others to actually see us as evil and act accordingly. It
>>>>> works, we keep falling for it. OTOH, for those here with a declared
>>>>> interest in emptying the US treasury, it's likewise beneficial to
> have
>>>>> the specter of an enemy out there. Fear sells.
>>>>>
>>>>> We have yet to actually declare war on anyone in this whole mess. How
>>> do
>>>>> you declare war on a tactic?
>>>>>
>>>>> Forced conversion and head taxes would go over like a lead balloon in
>>>>> the USA. Not gonna happen. We're far more sectarian than, say, Iraq.
>>>>>
>>>>> Responsible leadership is needed in the world to calm extremist
>>>>> tendencies on all sides and help rational people who are trying to
> get
>>>>> by in worsening times. At the same time we need to be, and are
>>>>> attempting to be, vigilant against any self righteous group with
>>>>> fantasies of violence in the USA.
>>>>>
>>>>> Any rush to some sort of "holy war" is irrational. There is nothing
>>> holy
>>>>> about war.
>>>>>
>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> I haven't seen us react with irrationality.....yet. Al
> Quaeda
>>>>> just
>>>>> came out with an ultimatum stating that it's full on war now and the
>>>>> west
>>>>> will be destroyed. The only way to save ourselves is to convert to
>>>>> Islam. So
>>>>> where to you draw the line between irrationality and self defense?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
>>> news:450ee7ef@linux...
>>>>>> Let's keep from reacting to irrationality with irrationality of our
>>>>> own.
>>>>>> There's a lot of fear mongering. Chicken Little is back.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>>>> It doesn't matter at all whether this was the Pope. The bottom
> line
>>> is
>>>>>> 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
>>> 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 would have
> been
>>>> an
>>>>>>>> exaggeration to blame everyone in the USA for that.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to the Catholic church which only very
>>>>>>>> recently apologized for the oppression of Galileo. The church
> hung
>>> on
>>>>>>>> tenaciously to the dogma of an earth-centered view of the
> universe
>>>>>>> while
>>>>>>>> denying the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, which describes
> the
>>>>>>>> actual way the solar system works.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> It also extends to a few Christian sects who, feeling similarly
>>>>>>>> insecure, tenaciously cling to the notion that the earth is only
>>>> about
>>>>>>>> 6,000 years old, by virtue of the biblical interpretations and
>>> clever
>>>>>>>> (at the time) calculations of an Irish Bishop several centuries
>>> ago,
>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>> in the face of solid current scientific evidence to the contrary.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some (not all) Christian churches

>>> who,
>>>>>>>> feeling similarly insecure, deny the solid and ever-mounting
>>> evidence
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>> evolution, responding with dogma in psuedo-scientific clothing,
> and
>>>> who
>>>>>>>> seek to water down scientific education in the USA.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to power hungry industries who pay big
>>>> bucks
>>>>>>>> to spread denial about global warming for short term gain. Who
> push
>>>> to
>>>>>>>> control oil in the middle east with force. With our guns blazing,
>>> our
>>>>>>>> soldiers dying and our debt rising astronomically. And who
>>> sometimes
>>>>>>>> hide behind Christianity to do so.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The fear of reason extends to some neoconservatives who find ways
>>> to
>>>>>>>> pretend that everyone is aligning against Christianity. And in
>>>>>>> spreading
>>>>>>>> this fear attempt to incite Christians to vote to keep them in
>>> power.
>>>>>>>> And in so pandering, help to continue the denial of reason and
> the
>>>>>>> focus
>>>>>>>> on the use of force.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Not that I'll change your mind, DC, so go ahead and declare
>>> victory.
>>>>>>> ;^)
>>>>>>>> Have a great week!
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> DC wrote:
>>>>>>>>> I thought this was worth reading 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

>>>>>>>>>> Regensberg, 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

> Benedict
>>>>>>>>>> further contrasts Christian belief with that of secular
> humanists
>>>>>>>>>> who see reason as being completely unbound of God.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> In response, both Islamists and secularists have demanded the

Subject: Re: church and state
Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 16:56:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>>>>>>>>>> is today guided far more by Nietzsche existentialist thought
> than

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an Indian Muslim leader doing precisely what

>>>>>>>>>> of New Delhi's historic Jama Masjid, India's largest mosque,

> to

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Reuters quotes an unnamed diplomat pointing out the Pope was,

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> The sec

Subject: Re: church and state
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 17:54:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ut the world,
>>>>>>>>> both are in decline.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Where the force of reason is defeated, Islamist and secularist

>>>>>>>>> with the Soviet Union, invading in June, 1941 after the collapse
>>>>>>>>> of the allied forces on the western front.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> What the Islamists and the New York Times both fear is having to

> or

> great
>>>>>>>>> logos, to this breadth of reason, that we invite our partners in

>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Their fear of reason can only lead the world to disaster.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>
>
>Count me in.

"Nappy" <mgrant01@san.rr.com> wrote in message news:45100198\$1@linux...

>
> I'm willing to pay for any upgrades as well.
>
> respect
> Nappy
>
>
> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>I was taking that for granted, since we all pulled together to help fund
>
>>Chuck's efforts. I have no problems paying for upgrades that are
>>delivered.
>>AA
>>
>>
>>"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
>>news:

Subject: Re: church and state
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 18 Aug 2006 18:20:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

0500, "Tony Benson"

> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>
> >With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
can
> >discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
more
> >of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
> >house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't
want
> >to read.
> >
> >Tony
> >
> >
> >"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa\$1@linux...
> >>
> >> for ... many times poeple.
> >> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
> >> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>
> >>>Thanks for the link. It looks like it might be a more interesting read
> >>>than what you might expect of a book on probability theory.
> >>>
> >>>Without risk management there would be no insurance.
> >>>
> >>>Seems like we have some major risk management headaches ahead in the
> >>>foreign relations area. I don't have much faith that our current
> >>>government understands the situation or is capable of brokering a
> >>>lasting and beneficial peace.
> >>>
> >>>Cheers,
> >>> -Jamie
> >>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>TCB wrote:
> >>>> I never said faith was limited to religion _at all_ because that
would
> >> be
> >>>> silly. I only bring this up because I think it's a very important
point.
> >>>> Nearly every time you read 'without faith there would be no XXXXXXXXX'
> >> it's
> >>>> just not true and XXXXXXXXX can get along just fine without faith.

> >>>> Probably
> >>>> the best popular book about risk is called 'Against the Gods' and
it's
> >> sort
> >>>> of about this very topic.
> >>>>
> >>>>
[http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/ 0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-2981628?ie=UTF8&am p;s=books](http://www.amazon.com/Against-Gods-Remarkable-Story-Risk/dp/0471295639/sr=8-1/qid=1158631839/ref=pd_bbs_1/002-2500887-2981628?ie=UTF8&am p;s=books)
> >>>>
> >>>> TCB
> >>>>
> >>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
> >>>>> There you go, clearly faith is not limited to religion. Although
just
> >> as
> >>>>
> >>>>> clearly it's important for religion.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> As to risk, many people have faith that their risks will pan out.
Some
> >>
> >>>>> people do things because they have such faith. I know people like
that.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> I am people like that. That doesn't preclude anyone from doing
> >>>>> something
> >>>>>
> >>>>> for some other reason, of course.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> If you want to say you don't have faith in anything, using any of
the
> >>
> >>>>> definitions below, then that's your prerogative and I don't have a
> >>>>> problem with that.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Cheers,
> >>>>> -Jamie
> >>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> TCB wrote:
> >>>>>> Here's dictionary.com
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> faith  /feɪθ/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled
> >>>>>> Pronunciation[feyth]
> >>>>>> Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation
> >>>>>> -noun

> >>>>> 1. confidence or trust in a person or thing: faith in another's
> >>>>> ability.
> >&

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 03:41:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

/>
>>>>>>>>>> threat
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on
>>>>>>>>>> our
>>>>>> own
>>>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
>>>>>>>>>> this
>>>>>> kind
>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
>>>>>>>>>> correct
>>>>>> thing
>>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>>>> do.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
>>>> and
>>>>>>>> hence
>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
>>>>>>>>>>>> choice
>>>>>> to
>>>>>>>> believe
>>>>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
>>>> of
>>>>>> Allah
>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>>>>>>>>>>>> commandments
>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> 24
>>>>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
>>>> is
>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>> sad,

>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>>>>>>>>>> fear
>>>>>>>>>> -
>>>>>>>>>> it's
>>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
>>>>>>>>>> personal
>>>>>>>>>> whims
>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
>>>> That
>>>>>>>>>> also
>>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in
>>>>>>>>>> God
>>>>>>>>>> and
>>>>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good life and had some false
>>>>>>>>>> hope
>>>>>>>>>> as
>>>>>>>>>> a
>>>>>>>>>> sense
>>>>>>>>>> of comfort along the way; if one doesn't believe and is
>>>>>>>>>> wrong,
>>>>>>>>>> then
>>>>>>>>>> at
>>>>>>>>>> best, all is lost for eternity. This is the paradox that we
>>>>>>>>>> should
>>>>>>>>>> be
>>>>>>>>>> considering, and yet the most fear-inducing thought is that
>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> President
>>>>>>>>>> might believe in something other than nothing. Is no belief
>>>>>>>>>> really
>>>>>>>>>> better
>>>>>>>>>> than belief? What reference point for right and wrong
>>>>>>>>>> accompanies
>>>>>>>>>> disbelief
>>>>>>>>>> in anything higher than one's own decisions? What reference
>>>>>>>>>> point
>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>> respect for other people's beliefs accompanies a lack of
>>>>>>>>>> belief
>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>>>>>>> any
>>>>>>>>>> guideline for living life and having respect and compassion
>>>>>>>>>> for

[illegible]

>>>>>>>>>> in
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>> very
>>>>>>>>> thing we prove day in and day out to be one of the most
>>>>>>>>> fallible
>>>>>>>>> characteristics of humanity - political and relativistic
>>>>>>>>> ideology.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I guess I ignored my own first comment....sorry about that.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> I should get back to mourning NI Battery 2's destruction of 10
>>>> hours
>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>> work
>>>>>>>>>>> :-(....
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Regards,
>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> On 9/16/06 9:09 PM, in article 450cbc70\$1@linux, "gene Lennon"
>>>>>>>>>>>>> <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I don't want to start another religious or political thread
>>>> -...
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> These are frightening times. While the true neocons in the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> administration
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> have had a variety of political, financial and power-based
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> reasons
>>>>>>>>>>> for
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> perusing
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the war against Iraq, the president has had an even scarier
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> motivation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Religion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> If you missed it, this week Bush has announced the "Third
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Great
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Awakening"
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of the international religious struggle. This is a good thing
>>>> as
>>>>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>>> sees
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> it and it has been partially brought on by the new fight
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> against
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> terrorists
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (Translation - Due to his good work in God's name). A war

>>>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>> he
>>>>>>>>>>>> depicts
>>>>>>>>>>>> as "a confrontation between good and evil."
>>>>>>>>>>>> In 2001 he used the word "crusade" and got into quite a bit
>>>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>> trouble
>>>>>>>>>>>> (as
>>>>>>>>>>>> has the Pope), but he seems to have the gloves off now.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Can anyone imagine a worse direction for the world to be
>>>>>>>>>>>> headed?
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Of course he also believes in the Rapture, so things could
>>>>>>>>>>>> easily
>>>>>>> go
>>>>>>>>>>>> down
>>>>>>>>>>>> hill from here.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> More on the "Third Awakening":
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/12/AR2006091201)
/12/AR2006091201
>>>>>>>>>>>> 59
>>>>>>>>>>>> 4_pf.html
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> `
>>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>

>i've never seen a sitting moon so....hell yeah. since i quit smoking
2 1/2 yrs ago i no longer get the exercise from coughing i used to.
on second thought that feat has also given me a bigger ass so let me
ponder on that a bit.

On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 13:36:51 -0600, "DJ"
<animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>Rick,
>
>Do you think it would help if we could just figure out a way to get into the
>UN gallery (do they have a gallery?) and then start mooning people? I want
>to do something constructive instead of sitting around bitching all the
>time.
>

>Deej
>
>
>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:k0c0h2hl6cc83qvha4esc96935fo3nqtb1@4ax.com...
>> i nominate you for john's diplomat search..props to you...damn, i
>> wasn't going to enter this fray...
>>
>> On Tue, 19 Sep 2006 11:31:50 -0500, "Tony Benson"
>> <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote:
>>
>> >With all due respect ulfiyya, the general consensus here is that anyone
>can
>> >discuss anything they feel like discussing. This group has morphed into
>more
>> >of a gathering place for PARIS users and former users. An online coffee
>> >house as such. The key for you is to simply skip the topics you don't
>want
>> >to read.
>> >
>> >Tony
>> >
>> >
>> >"ulfiyya" <ulfiyya@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:450f7bfa\$1@linux...
>> >>
>> >> for ... many times poeple.
>> >> THIS IS NOT A POLITIK SITE!!!
>> >> This is ...Paris site (Music) Remember...
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> Keep youre Jamie K <Meta&#

Subject: Re: Oh gawd . .

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 05:23:13 GMT

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

>> >>>>>>> examples
>> >>>>>>> of selfless dedication to helping others on the one hand, and
>> >>>>>>> hijacked
>> >>>>>>> religions used to legitimize earthly power structures in other
>> >>>>>>> cases.
>> >>>>>>> Dedric, I look forward to talking with you about the positives
>and
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>>> negatives of various religions, and where a moral culture ought

>to
>> >>>> go
>> >>>>>>> >from here, whenever we next get together.
>> >>>>>>> Cheers,
>> >>>>>>> -Jamie
>> >>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> >>>>>>> Hey Jimmy,
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> No doubt one can be a good person without believing in God -
>there
>> >>>> are
>> >>>>>>> tons
>> >>>>>>>> of great people with no faith, or very little. That in and of
>> >>>>>>>> itself
>> >>>>>>> tells
>> >>>>>>>> me there must be a God so even non-believers would have a
>strong
>> >> sense
>> >>>>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>> right and wrong on a societal and even global level.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> To walk through some thoughts: with no God, or higher
>reference
>> >> point,
>> >>>>>>>> what
>> >>>>>>>>> would be considered moral, or at least good? What would one
>use
>> >> to
>> >>>>>>> decide
>> >>>>>>>>> what is right and wrong?
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> Laws? Most would agree that we can't legislate morality now,
>so
>> >> with
>> >>>>>>>> no
>> >>>>>>>>>> basis for what morality is, why would we even bother with laws
>> >>>>>>>>>> since
>> >>>>>>>>>>> everyone would make their own choices anyway?
>> >>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> Intellect? That would simply depend on what one chose to
>accept
>> >> as
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>> "intelligent" thought, based completely on opinion.
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Reasoning and Logic? Logic is determined by a hypothesis that

>has
 >> >>>> a
 >> >>>>>> proven
 >> >>>>>>>> outcome in a given situation. Change the situation, and the
 >> >>>>>>>> reasoning
 >> >>>>>>>> or
 >> >>>>>>>> logic behind the "right" or "wrong" could easily change.
 >> >>>>>>>>
 >> >>>>>>>> Experience? What if one's experience is filled with hatred,
 >> >>>>>>>> abuse,
 >> >>>>>> anger
 >> >>>>>>>> and violence, or worse? Then someone would have to decide
 >whose
 >> >> experience
 >> >>>>>>>> we would use as a reference point. There would be no guarantee
 >> >> that
 >> >>>>>> person
 >> >>>>>>>> or persons had experiences that would be best for the good of
 >the
 >> >>>> whole.
 >> >>>>>>>> Survival instinct? If it were a reference point, then
 >stealing,
 >> >> lying,
 >> >>>>>>>> cheating and even killing would be perfectly justified as those
 >> >> can
 >> >>>>>> be
 >> >>>>>>>> means
 >> >>>>>>>> of survival.
 >> >>>>>>>>
 >> >>>>>>>> Why would right and wrong even exist? I would think that the
 >> >>>>>>>> differences
 >> >>>>>>>> between societies' definitions of right and wrong, assuming
 >> >>>>>>>> societies
 >> >>>>>>>> even
 >> >>>>>>>> existed, would be so drastic we would never have ventured into
 >any
 >> >>>> form
 >> >>>>>>>> of
 >> >>>>>>>>>> inter-cultural/inter-geographic interaction, much less
 >> >>>>>>>>>> relationships,
 >> >>>>>>>>>> diplomacy, collaboration, trade, and open travel.
 >> >>>>>>>>>>
 >> >>>>>>>>>> As long as "morals" are only relative to each individual, they
 >> >>>>>>>>>> aren't
 >> >>>>>>>>>> absolute morals that would last longer than the time it takes
 >to
 >> >> make
 >> >>>>>>>> the

>> >>>>>>>> choice. We would just have 6.5 billion opinions. There would
>> >>>>>>>> only
>> >>>>>> be
>> >>>>>>> an
>> >>>>>>>> ever changing perspective on what seems to "make sense" at the
>> >>>>>>>> time,
>> >>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>> based on this premise, even "making sense" would vary from
>person
>> >>>> to
>> >>>>>> person,
>> >>>>>>>> day to day, minute to minute. In that case, our prisons would
>> >>>>>>>> either
>> >>>>>>> be
>> >>>>>>>> filled with innocent people simply judged "wrong" at the time
>> >>>>>>>> because
>> >>>>>>>> their
>> >>>>>>>> choices didn't match the preferences of the majority; or we
>> >>>>>>>> wouldn't
>> >>>>>> have
>> >>>>>>>> prisons, or likely even organized societies.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> But is the majority always right? How would we know if there
>were
>> >>>> no
>> >>>>>>>> absolutes that supercede the majority in some form?
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> If there were no right and wrong, there would be no
>consequences
>> >> of
>> >>>>>> either,
>> >>>>>>>> or at least we wouldn't view the outcome as a good or bad
>> >>>>>>>> consequence
>> >>>>>>> - it
>> >>>>>>>> would just be another event in time.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> But by grace and as a gift of freedom, God gave us a choice,
>both
>> >>>> in
>> >>>>>> whether
>> >>>>>>>> to believe in Him and whether to make right or wrong decisions.
>> >> With
>> >>>>>>> moral
>> >>>>>>>> absolutes (God's word) as a reference we have a way to evaluate
>> >> drastically
>> >>>>>>>> differing situations on an equivalent basis; with consistency
>in
>> >> reasoning

>> >>>>>>>> and compassion; by choice and instinct rather than puppetry.
>Even
>> >>>> when
>> >>>>>>>> we
>> >>>>>>>> choose to do wrong, He is willing to forgive us. Without that
>> >>>>>>>> option
>> >>>>>>>> to
>> >>>>>>>> choose, balanced by God's grace and forgiveness, there would be
>> >> no
>> >>>> power
>> >>>>>>>> in
>> >>>>>>>> choosing to believe in Him. That's what makes God a personal
>and
>> >>>> loving
>> >>>>>>>> God
>> >>>>>>>> rather than a dictator or puppet master.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> Odd as it may seem to anyone who doesn't believe, I can see God
>> >> in
>> >>>> the
>> >>>>>>>> way
>> >>>>>>>> that 1) we as a group of intelligent people on this forum can
>> >>>>>>>> discuss
>> >>>>>>>> completely opposing opinions and still care enough to consider
>> >>>>>>>> insulting,
>> >>>>>>>> belittling, slandering and hating one another an intolerable
>> >>>>>>>> concept;
>> >>>>>>>> and 2)
>> >>>>>>>> in all likelihood agree that peace and compassion completely
>trump
>> >>>> greed
>> >>>>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>> power in importance to life and survival together on this
>planet.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> Regards,
>> >>>>>>>> Dedric
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>> On 9/17/06 7:12 PM, in article 450df091@linux, "Uptown Jimmy"
>> >>>>>>>> <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> The idea that one needs to believe in a god in order to have a
>> >> strong
>> >>>>>>>> morals
>> >>>>>>>>>> is absurd, I think.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> Jimmy
>> >>>>>>>>>>

>> >>>>>>>>>> have heard missionaries to these countries speak - it's a
>> >>>>>>>>>> different
>> >>>>>>>>>> world
>> >>>>>>>>>> from the free discussions and widely varying opinions we have
>> >> here.
>> >>>>>>>>>> People
>> >>>>>>>>>> die for converting to anything else, or their families do.
>At
>> >> best,
>> >>>>>>>>>> their
>> >>>>>>>>>> families disown them and they sneak out of the country under
>> >>>>>>>>>> threat
>> >>>>>>>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>>>> death. In fact it's the exact opposite of the "freedom" our
>> >>>>>>>>>> country
>> >>>>>>>>>> continually pushes the limits of. Odd that we would turn on
>our
>> >>>> own
>> >>>>>>>>>> country
>> >>>>>>>>>> in favor of supporting, or at least turning a blind eye to
>this
>> >>>> kind
>> >>>>>>>>>> of
>> >>>>>>>>>> ideology, somehow believing that is the more politically
>correct
>> >>>> thing
>> >>>>>>>>>> to
>> >>>>>>>>>> do.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> The problem I see isn't religion, but a lack of faith in God,
>> >> and
>> >>>>>> hence
>> >>>>>>>>>> any
>> >>>>>>>>>> sense of direction and moral guidance. God gives us the
>choice
>> >>>> to
>> >>>>>> believe
>> >>>>>>>>>> or not. Based on documents of their activities - in the name
>> >> of
>> >>>> Allah
>> >>>>>>>>>> the
>> >>>>>>>>>> 9/11 terrorists pretty much broke every one of the 10
>> >>>>>>>>>> commandments
>> >>>>>> in
>> >>>>>>>>>> 24
>> >>>>>>>>>> hours. That may seem a trivial or even silly fact, but there
>> >> is
>> >>>> a

>> >>>>>> sad,
>> >>>>>>>>>> and
>> >>>>>>>>>> frightening irony there. Faith in God isn't what one should
>> >>>>>>>>>> fear
>> >>>>>> -
>> >>>>>>>> it's
>> >>>>>>>>>> believing in anything that conveniently appeases one's
>personal
>> >>>> whims
>> >>>>>>>> that
>> >>>>>>>>>> is the true danger.... the terrorists proved that in one day.
>> >> That
>> >>>>>>>> also
>> >>>>>>>>>> includes believing in nothing.
>> >>>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>>> As Blaise Pascal once said (paraphrased): if one believes in
>God
>> >>>> and
>> >>>>>>>> is
>> >>>>>>>>>> wrong, at worst one has lived a good live and had some false
>> >>>>>>>>>> hope
>> >>>>>> as
>> >>>>>>>> a
>> >>>>>>>>>> sense
>> >>>>>>>>>> of comfort al
