
Subject: Some PCIe questions

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Wed, 31 Jan 2007 18:05:57 GMT

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

onto them and be in good shape as well.

that's tempting. I'm tired of building computers. After the time I've spent on this one, never again.....well.....maybe never.....sorta', depending on whether.....;o)

Deej

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:45fcddab\$1@linux...

>

> My understanding is that Adobe has done a pretty good job with

> multi-threading

> their apps. And even if she's only _using_ one at a time if she's running

> more than one app simultaneously it should help a bit. I'd got with your

> first instinct.

>

> Alternately, you could jump off the self build at get a Dell Core 2 Duo

> and

> wipe all the crap they put onto them and be in good shape as well.

>

> Good luck,

>

> TCB

>

> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>>I built Amy a graphics computer recently. she is running Adobe suite

>>(Photoshop, Illustrator, Pagemaker etc.) and a lot of other graphics

>>related software. He CPU is an AMD 64 4200 x 2 (2 x 2100 cores). She's

>>jonesin for a little more horsepower and so last night Ibought myself an

>

>>Opteron 185 for my Cubase rig and I was going to replace her 4200 dual

>>core

>

>>with the 4800 dual core I'm currently running in my cubase rig. this will

>

>>give her two 2400 cores. I've also got an AMD 64 3700 single core CPU

>>here.

>

>>She's usually working with one app at a time. I'm just wondering if the

>

>>single core CPU wouldn't offer her more processing power under these

>>circumstances and actually be a better processor for her needs.

>>

>>I'm going to do some Googling on this but if anyone has any insight into
>
>>this situation, it would be much appreciated.
>>
>>Thanks,
>>
>>Deej
>>
>>
>I found a bunch of stuff on multithreading for Adobe aps last night. Looks
like the duallies are definitely the way to go for Photoshop, etc.

thanks,
Deej

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:45fcd938\$1@linux...

>
>
> I actually thought Adobe kinda had all that multi-threading dual processor
> stuff down pat pretty early, though that's all kinda a faded memory now.
>
> All I can say is desktop publishing on Mac's is very popular, and they had
> dual core as a common thing before PC's were doing it. Traditionally Adobe
> have gotten their apps up to current specs pretty quickly in the past.
>
> I think you'll find they have their dual core stuff all sorted, though I
> am talking more from instinct than knowledge here.
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>I built Amy a graphics computer recently. she is running Adobe suite
>>(Photoshop, Illustrator, Pagemaker etc.) and a lot of other graphics
>>related software. He CPU is an AMD 64 4200 x 2 (2 x 2100 cores). She's
>>jonesin for a little more horsepower and so last night Ibought myself an
>
>>Opteron 185 for my Cubase rig and I was going to replace her 4200 dual
>>core
>
>>with the 4800 dual core I'm currently running in my cubase rig. this will
>
>>give her two 2400 cores. I've also got an AMD 64 3700 single core CPU
>>here.
>
>>She's usually working with one app at a time. I'm just wondering if the
>
>>single core CPU wouldn't offer her more processing power under these

>>circumstances and actually be a better processor for her needs.
>>
>>I'm going to do some Googling on this but if anyone has any insight into
>
>>this situation, it would be much appreciated.
>>
>>Thanks,
>>
>>Deej
>>
>>
>Yup, that reminds me of the nylon coated strings, a vintage P bass and an
old classic Ampeg combo tube. That bouncy punchy round warm thang.
Thanks for bringing some light to this.

AA

PS.. is there any instrument SW "doesn't" play, man?

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:45fc73f9\$1@linux...
> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9pYux5-d1Es>
>
> Now you've got me started on Stevie. He's one of my all time heroes. Back
> in the 80's one of my buddies' girlfriends was in his band. Some great
> stories. I wish I could have been in some of the sessions. I would have
> loved to have met him. Check the bass line on this.....it's been kickin
> my ass since the first time I heard it on AM radio. I know he didn't play
> it himself, but it's stuff like this that helped define the overall
> wonderfulness of his music. His productions were/are just so interesting
> and that was the first time a bass line ever got my attention in a song
> coming out of the mono speaker of an AM radio in a car.. This is the
> reason I don't sell my B-15N.
>
> ;o)
>
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:45fc6f97@linux...
>> http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wX_ukHFNP7Y
>>
>> This "was" it. Apparently find and pay money for it now young paduan must
>> do
>> ;o(
>>
>>
>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrot

Subject: Re: Some PCIe questions

Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Thu, 01 Feb 2007 02:34:48 GMT

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

> some sort of fraud, I would ask what the payoff was, since
> the disciples clearly believed what they said, to the extent of
> dying horrible deaths, and never recanting their beliefs. They
> lived lives of dedication and faith, spreading Christianity all over
> the known world with no payoff other than saved humans.

>
> it is clear that they believed what they preached, and they were
> there to witness it.

>
> So, the synoptic problem, and the existence or non-existence
> of Q, are interesting, but unrelated to the reality of Jesus.

>
> Lee Strobel has some terrific videos on the issue of the
> Bible's credibility. Here's one:

>
> <http://www.leestrobel.com/videos/Bible/strobelT1041.htm>

>
> Watch as many of these as you have time for.

>
> <http://www.leestrobel.com/Bible.htm>

>
>
> Your perspective is, of course, as threatened by mine by the
> current war on faith. Actually yours is more threatened
> because you cannot base your views on anything other than
> personal need and choice. The Bible calls this building your
> house upon the sand.

>
> Here's something I wrote on the coming war on faith:

>
> [http://doncicchetti.blogspot.com/2006/11/assault-on-faith.ht ml](http://doncicchetti.blogspot.com/2006/11/assault-on-faith.html)

>
>
> DC

>
> Doug Wellington <doug@parisfaqs.com> wrote:

> So you're basing everything on a self-referential structure?

Whoops! Selective quoting again... Follow the whole line
of reasoning please. This is a straw man.

Let me ask you a question that will resolve this for you:

Do you believe that the issues you mention show that Jesus was not a real person, and was certainly not the Son of God?

If so, then you have your answer. If not, why are you raising them?

>And of the four gospels, why is it that only John asserts that
>Jesus is God?

Do you doubt this? Why or why not? If you doubt it, how does your definition of "evidence" influence your decision?

>(Refer back to a previous message when I wondered how the
>church would have been different if the Gospel of Thomas had been chosen

>by Irenaeus instead of the Gospel of John. But of course he couldn't do

>that; he was a fine upstanding member of the Orthodoxy.)

And of course, we all know that the church is simply based upon human wishful thinking and the views of those closest to the time of Jesus, and their judgements about the canon, are much easier to critique and revise today, almost 2000 years later, right?

>(BTW,
>please use "AD" if the more scholarly "CE" offends you.)

That's hilarious... Your atheist assumptions are as clear as can be aren't they? Any view of history that includes Christ as a reality, is not scholarly.... ok Doug.

>Are you claiming that all non-Christians are atheists? There are at
>least three major religious groups that profess belief in the God of
>Abraham, yet not all of them agree on the role of Jesus.

Of course, the opposite of atheist is not Christian, it is theist...

Looks like you have a few more on the other side than you thought.

>NOTE: If you substitute the word agnosticism for atheism in that
>sentence, then there is a possibility that we may be able to agree.

Well, as soon as you determine what constitutes proof.
The belief that only the natural world, as

Subject: Re: Some PCIe questions
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Thu, 01 Feb 2007 03:11:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hat knowledge, that Christians do have substantive reasons for our faith, and 2 more things that allowed me to put this issue to bed.

The first was the day I realized, from years of study and reading, that Darwinism is garbage. It is the last of the 19th-century mystery religions.

Darwin said: "If it can be shown that the cell is more complex than I had thought, than absolutely, my theory would totally fall apart"

Well, it's thousands of times more complex than he thought, and his theory is still around isn't it?

Take a look at this:

http://www.arn.org/arnproducts/php/book_show_item.php?id=26

and if you think, oh that's just one book, then just read the abstracts for the first 20 of these books, and you will see the trouble Darwin is really in today:

http://www.arn.org/arnproducts/php/book_show_catalog.php

The other was the realization that nothing else, nothing, is as likely to be true, and fits the reality of human life, as well as the words and thoughts of Jesus Christ. That is why all those guys willingly died on crosses, upside down sometimes, others beheaded, others torn apart by animals in the colliseum, and still others burned at the stake as heretics, to keep the Bible alive and Christianity vital. And so it is.

>Not enough time? Same reason you haven't answered the vast majority of

>my other questions?

Rubbish Doug. I was running out the door to a birthday party.
I did answer you. Did you see it?

>You seem quite willing to take the time to further
>your own agenda, imply that I am a heretic and directly accuse Thad of
>being a bigot, but when I ask for justification you don't have enough
>time?

First, Thad is clearly a bigot, and while he would not use that word, he regularly expresses hate for millions of people, some of whom would take a bullet to save his life. Second, your views are clearly heretical with regards to Christianity. Do you deny this?

Be a happy heretic. Heck, start a band and name it that.

You do not answer to me.

best,

DCi don't know about you but i'm having a slight problem with "sister deej" or "sister simplicity". how does amy feel about you becoming a nun?

On Mon, 19 Mar 2007 12:13:24 -0600, "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>After reading this entire inspirational discourse by you guys I have decided
>that I have no real choice other than to become a nun.
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.org> wrote in message [news:45fe0308\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:45fe0308$1@linux...)
>>
>> Ok, the synoptic problem.
>>
>> There has been much scholarly debate about the similarities
>> of Matthew and Luke to Mark, and the suggestion has been
>> that the others were therefore copied.
>>
>> This is a problem for the verbal-inspiration folks because
>> they believe that each word was dictated by God and is
>> infallible and original.
>>
>> I am a thought-inspiration guy and I think it is clear that the
>> words are the words of men. Hence, it is all very interesting
>> to me, but the important thing is not the borrowing, if it

>> happened, but rather the unity and quality of the message.
>>
>> Should you try to assert that this apparent borrowing supports
>> some sort of fraud, I would ask what the payoff was, since
>> the disciples clearly believed what they said, to the extent of
>> dying horrible deaths, and never recanting their beliefs. They
>> lived lives of dedication and faith, spreading Christianity all over
>> the known world with no payoff other than saved humans.
>>
>> it is clear that they believed what they preached, and they were
>> there to witness it.
>>
>> So, the synoptic problem, and the existence or non-existence
>> of Q, are interesting, but unrelated to the reality of Jesus.
>>
>> Lee Strobel has some terrific videos on the issue of the
>> Bible's credibility. Here's one:
>>
>> <http://www.leestrobel.com/videos/Bible/strobelT1041.htm>
>>
>> Watch as many of these as you have time for.
>>
>> <http://www.leestrobel.com/Bible.htm>
>>
>>
>> Your perspective is, of course, as threatened by mine by the
>> current war on faith. Actually yours is more threatened
>> because you cannot base your views on anything other than
>> personal need and choice. The Bible calls this building your
>> house upon the sand.
>>
>> Here's something I wrote on the coming war on faith:
>>
>> <http://doncicchetti.blogspot.com/2006/11/assault-on-faith.html>
>>
>>
>> DC
>>
>>
>in my book sista D...way cool. have you bought a habit yet...?

On Mon, 19 Mar 2007 12:10:57 -0600, "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com>
wrote:

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

>news:f3ktv2li2cge7utqds06a0cmoo5kfggogn@4ax.com...
>> and thank god they couldn't find anything wrong with it...i feel like
>> i've been here before...
>>
>> yeay
>
>soooooo.....it was purposely (rather than accidentally) designed not to
>function? Now how cool is that?
>
>;o(
>
>
>I'm looking for one of those Sally Field habits that will allow me to
levitate.

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:4lltv2p5g89pfv3m0bj5vhdg7s0ei2vi0j@4ax.com...
> in my book sista D...way cool.
