
Subject: Any know of a good way to sync an Adrenaline to paris?

Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 22:46:51 GMT

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

unately, I think our "War On Terror" is more of a religious crusade than is openly admitted.

There was a time in human history when religion ruled the Western world. It's called "The Dark Ages."

Sarah

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

Subject: Re: Any know of a good way to sync an Adrenaline to paris?

Posted by [EK Sound](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 22:54:53 GMT

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

message

news:c9u6e2dqskmvij58nuv4tmj0gs1omuf518@4ax.com...

> sarah

>

> everyone wants to be the holder of "the truth" and feel compelled to

> convince others even if they have to kill them to do it. thankfully

> not all go to that extreme...unfortunately many are willing to do just

> that...on both sides of the argument. religion has to be in the top

> ten killers of humanity throughout history. That tv special totally sucked. They must need some cash bad.

"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:

><http://www.professionalseminars.net/tps/>

>

>can you believe, new things are coming ?

>

>AA

>

>hmmm.

i don't get boxy.

but this amp could get just about any sound you want out of it. from rectifier high gain... to phat bluesy... to crystal clean.... all with a little Mesa character.

2 channels.... 4 'modes'... modern high gain and blues, vintage high gain and clean.

all kinds of ways to shape the tone if ya wanna tweak away... ON THE BACK OF THE HEAD... switch to bold or spongy... vacuum tubes or silicon diodes.

i am happy.

jeremy

"Jeremy Luzier" <j.luzier@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:44e12d9a\$1@linux...

> Just had to tell somebody!!

>

> ;-)

>

> Jeremy

>

> Muse wrote:

> I have a good track with a couple of spots that clipped. How can I repair
> that clipping?

>

> Thanks, Kevin

>

>

Good question. You could cut 'n paste from other areas, or try to
redraw, but I doubt that would work."DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

> <http://www.fff.org/comment/ed1001h.asp>

>

Hi, DJ!

> Your thoughts on this article? Are the assumptions made valid?

pretty much

>

> If not, why?

>

> Are the options suggested as solutions good ones?

pretty much, but a lot has happened since that was written

let me direct you to a little email from muckraker Palast which tells it
better than I could.

second post from the top

<http://sizzlingizzards.blogspot.com/>

-stevegene Lennon wrote:

> "Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote:

>> I have a few potential clients that would like to sit in on a session while

>> I mix their tracks. I figure this will take extra time so it seems fair

>> to charge an hourly rate on top of the flat fee for the mix.

>>

>> Any ideas?

>>

>> Jesse

>

>

> What you need is a big sign in your control room.

>

>

>

> _____
> MIX RATES

>

> You Watch - \$35/hour

> You Comment - \$50/hour

> You Help - \$100/hour

> _____

>

That made me laugh. Thanks.Sarah wrote:

> Hahaha! That's funny. Reminds me of another joke:

>

> Jack went to a urologist and told him that he was having a problem, in

> that, he was unable to get his penis erect. After a complete exam the

> doctor told Jack that the muscles around the base of his penis were damaged

> from a prior viral infection and there was nothing he could do for him.

> However, he knew of an experimental treatment that might be applicable, if

> he were willing to take the risk.

>

> The treatment consisted of implanting muscle tissue from an elephant's

> trunk in Jack's penis. Jack thought about it for a while. The thought of

> going through life without ever experiencing sex again was just too much

> for him to bear. So, with the assurance that there would be no cruelty or

> adverse effect on the elephant, Jack decided to go for it.

>

> A few weeks after the operation, Jack was given the green light to use

> his newly renovated equipment. As a result, he planned a romantic evening

> with his girlfriend and took her to one of the nicest restaurants in the

> city. However, in the middle of dinner he felt a stirring between his

> legs that continued to the point of being extremely painful. To release

> the
> pressure, Jack unzipped his fly and immediately his penis sprung from his
> pants, went to the top of the table, grabbed a roll, then returned to his
> pants.

>
> His girl friend was stunned at first, but then with a sly smile on her
> face said: "Jack, that was incredible. Can you do that again?"

>
> Jack, with his eyes watering, replied: "I think I can, but I'm not sure
> that I can fit another roll up my ass."

>
> :)

>
> "rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:f093e2hhl6uklcm5lqiuvgrv7b8l0pd3ca@4ax.com...
>> An elephant is walking through the jungle when he comes across a
>> naked man
>> standing in a clearing.

>>
>> The elephant slowly looks the man up and down and says,
>>
>> "How the hell do ya feed yourself with that?"

>>
>>
>
>

Very good! One of the biggest challenges we face is how to have constructive dialog
between people who operate from very different assumptions about the
nature of reality.

Great post, Sarah.

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

Sarah wrote:

> (heavy sigh) I'm not sure why I'm continuing with this . . . I learned
> years ago you can't argue with a religious person. Yet I feel compelled to
> make my views clear to you, since you are pretty much consistently wrong in
> your assumptions about what I'm saying. I think you're still trying to view
> me as a "type" rather than just as that unique thing I like to call "me."

>
> First of all, the term "blind faith" is pretty much redundant. Faith is
> essentially, by definition, blind. Faith is "belief that does not rest on
> logical proof or material evidence." You can have your own definition if
> you need to, but that's from the dictionary, and makes sense to me. If you

> have proof or evidence, it's not longer a belief, is it? I believe in
 > gravity, even though I can't explain it to you. It's obviously,
 > demonstrably, and universally agreeably real.
 >
 > Second, I am not saying God is unknowable . . . I'm saying I personally do
 > not know who or what created this universe or when or why, and I see no
 > evidence that anyone else does either, in spite of their fervent claims. I
 > do believe in a higher power which is very exhilarating to feel truly
 > connected to, but the attempts of religion in general to describe this
 > "supreme being" anthropomorphically just strike me as very superficial and
 > frankly, kind of childish. I put "God" in quotes because I think it's silly
 > to try and turn this awesome everpresent life force into a "guy in the sky."
 > I do not "blind" myself with this point of view. Quite the opposite, my
 > mind is wide open to spiritual experience, not limited to ancient dogma that
 > I have no reason to believe.
 >
 > Which leads me to the real point I was hoping to make in fewer words: I
 > have been arguing these ideas with believers since I was 17 (LONG time ago),
 > and in all that time not ONE of them has given me a REASON to believe that
 > the bible is anything more than legend, parable, mythology, and a smattering
 > of history. I should believe it's the word of God why? Because it claims
 > to be? Those are the claims of Roman bishops and other ancient human beings
 > whose motives and honesty I know nothing about. And if the bible is the
 > word of God, I'm not impressed. I expect better from a supreme being.
 >
 > Like the dozens before you, you tell me repeatedly what you believe in a way
 > that suggests no opposing belief can possibly be true. I know WHAT you
 > believe, I've heard it a thousand times over the last 30-some years. What I
 > don't know is WHY you believe it. Because it gives you hope? Because you
 > were desperate for answers and a bible was handy? Because your parents
 > believed it? Because you dropped acid and saw Jesus? Because you happened
 > to be born here rather than India or Iran? And if you had been born in
 > India or Iran, would you be just as fervently Hindu or Muslim?
 >
 > Nor has anyone ever been able to explain the logic in a supposedly
 > omnipotent being sending his son to die for our sins. How does this make
 > any sense? Isn't it more likely that Jesus simply became enough of a threat
 > to the Romans and the Jewish heirarchy that they decided to kill him?
 >
 > You speak a lot about assumptions. OK, here's one you seem to share with
 > other believers that drives me nuts: without God there is no right or
 > wrong. This is such nonsense. One does not need to believe in God, Heaven,
 > or Hell to know the difference between right and wrong and to behave
 > accordingly. "A man's ethical behavior should be based effectually on
 > sympathy, education, and social ties and needs; no religious basis is
 > necessary. Man would indeed be in a poor way if he had to be restrained by
 > fear of punishment and hope of reward after death." - Albert Einstein
 >

> And finally, I didn't mention "ghouls and head choppers" because the evil of
> "ghouls and head choppers" is not in dispute. I'm concerned about what has
> been done and is being done in my name as an American, because I believe
> that to also be evil and I'm just a little more than worried about the
> potential consequences of this.
>
> But I have to be honest . . . I feel like I just wasted another hour that I
> could have been catching up on sleep in. I should have learned by now that
> the more you challenge fixed beliefs, the harder the believer clings to
> them. You are of course free to believe what you want, but again, beliefs
> are by definition unproven, and therefore someone else's beliefs are not
> wrong simply because they contradict yours.
>
> OK, I mean it this time . . . I give up.
>
> Sarah
>
>
> "DC" <dc@spammersinmaui.com> wrote in message news:44e23a46\$1@linux...
>> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>>> The problem with blind faith is that one risks being blinded by faith.
>>> (Speaking from personal experience).
>> Faith in God is not blind. What is blind is the choice to call God
>> unknowable. That is a choice to remain blind, and its source is
>> solely and admittedly, human. Your assumption is that all views are
>> human at the source.
>>
>> I disagree emphatically.
>>
>> Everything proceeds from one's assumptions. Even considering
>> that the creator cared enough to send his son to die for us,
>> changes the whole world. Scary huh?
>>
>>
>>> Perhaps the only thing "God" ever said to us was "Survive!" and then left
>> it
>>> up to us to figure out that cooperation works better than competition.
>>
>> If God is in quotes for you, then why would "god's" opinion
>> matter? Well it doesn't of course. Survive, don't survive, bake
>> cookies, bake Jews, who is to say no? Why should anyone care if
>> they do? All is permitted.
>>
>> This is not God's plan for us.
>>
>>
>>> The
>>> "Golden Rule" is not simply a nice idea, it's a very practical and

>>> effective
>>> way to live peacefully with our fellow humans.
>> And the greedy dirtbag says "the one with the gold makes the
>> rules".
>>
>> And you disapprove. With only "god" (otherwise known as Sarah's
>> opinion) to rebut him, why should he care?
>>
>>
>>> As far as speculating on the afterlife, I just don't care. I'm fine with
>>> the mystery, in fact, I like a good mystery. Sure, it can be fun to say
>>> "what if this . . ." or "what if that . . ." but let's be honest here
>> --
>>> none of us will know until the time comes, and maybe not even then. And
>> I'm
>>> sorry, but "because the bible tells me so" doesn't work for me. It's just
>>> stuff that was written by the brighter members of some fairly backward
>>> human
>>> societies thousands of years ago who may or may not have been inspired by
>> a
>>> supreme being.
>>
>> And you cannot see that this is merely your view, not fact.
>> It is an assertion that there are no miracles, that God does not
>> care if we have a way to know Him or not, that things proceeded in
>> the past as they do today, and Jesus' death and resurrection are
>> human myths created, as all "god talk" is, by humans to comfort
>> themselves...
>>
>> You may not be an atheist, but you accept *all* of their basic
>> assumptions about existence.
>>
>>
>>> Meanwhile, back to the original topic: picture 100,000 dead Iraqis
>>> (conservative estimate). Picture them all together in a pile. What do
>> you
>>> think . . . would it fill a football stadium, like a big bowl of brown
>>> rice?
>>> I don't know, but now tell me how many of those were terrorists? 100?
>> 500?
>>> 1000? It doesn't matter does it? Not to those who were innocent and
>>> their
>>> families.
>>>
>>> Now picture 2500 dead American soldiers and the 62,000 wounded or maimed.
>>> If we were lied into this "war" based on hidden agendas, I can think of
>> some
>>> heads of state whose heads should roll. They probably won't, but it's a

>>> nice thought. Picture Bush, Cheney, and Rumsfeld in orange jumpsuits and
>>> chains . . . ni-i-i-i-ice. I feel better.

>>>

>>> Sarah

>>

>> And it is this view that concerns me that we, as a people, are no
>> longer able to protect freedom. There were innocents killed in all
>> wars. This is no different. Would you broadcast from Dresden
>> or Nagasaki calling for the jailing of Truman? By your rules, you
>> would have to.

>>

>> We now have a whole generation of people who cannot bring themselves to do
>> what they must to protect our way of life.

>> Given that we face the most evil and implacable enemy in many
>> years, I am not sure that we will retain the freedom that those
>> WWII vets you admire so much, fought and died for.

>>

>> And finally, notice please, not one word of condemnation for the
>> ghouls and head choppers. Those who would use baby bottles
>> for binary explosives and die, with their infant in their arms, to kill
>> some of us. Not one word. This is why you simply are not
>> convincing me here. It is selective pacifism, pointed only at
>> Israel and the west and there is no righteousness in it.

>>

>> DC

>>

>>

>>

>

>Cool Edit Pro a few years back had a decent declip algo.....

AA

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:44e39a52\$1@linux...

> Muse wrote:

>> I have a good track with a couple of spots that clipped. How can I repair
>> that clipping?

>>

>> Thanks, Kevin

> Good question. You could cut 'n paste from other areas, or try to redraw,

> but I doubt that would work. This is similar to what I did to the LP in that I shaved/filed the neck
back

towards the body, at a bit of a slant with the smaller strings being closer
to the body. It definitely made a difference, so I'm right there with you
bro. I keep my action REAL low, so pressing the first fret may effect other
guitarists differently but I seriously thought it to be a design flaw in the
gtr itself and now I'm quite curious about measuring my other axes.
Unfortunately, the amount of work (if it's even possible) to my locking nut
guitars makes this about a no way project for me, but I may pick up on the

LP again. Cool that I'm not losing my mind/alone in my conclusions about this, mucho 'G for the validation DC.

AA

"DC" <dc@spammersinnyc.com> wrote in message news:44e36951\$1@linux...

>
> Ok, here's the short version. (It's my wife's birthday and we are
> getting out of town)
>
> I will do a longer version, with pics, later.
>
> I started thinking about all this a year or so ago when I got my
> Petersen Virtual Strobe tuner. On the chromatic setting you can
> check the intonation very easily at the nut by perfectly tuning the
> open string and the pressing down the string at the first fret.
>
> Ouch, my guitars averaged 4 out of 6 strings out of tune.
>
> (btw, let me add, that you cannot fix this problem with adjusting
> your tuning. You can make it a bit better, in certain keys, but you
> can't fix it. oh, also, if the height of the string slot is right, the
> pressing down of the string is not significant here in terms of tuning
> accuracy. a fact I doubted, until I checked it)
>
>
> Then my guitar builder friend told me about this guy.
>
> <http://www.mimf.com/nutcomp/>
>
> Check out the pics if you don't want to read the whole thing.
>
> BTW, none of the fixed staggered nuts like the Earvana are likely
> to truly work well unless you use the exact same guitar, and strings
> that they used. Fixed, staggered nuts suffer from the same design
> flaw as fixed bridges at the other end of the guitar - one size fits all.
>
> Well it doesn't. Not if you want it right.
>
> Anyway, I first did a version of Delft's nut a year ago on one of the
> guitars using pick material of different thicknesses as shim stock
> and attaching them with super glue. Worked great. The guitar
> played more in tune than any guitar I have played. (I do use the
> Petersen sweetened tuning BTW, but do NOT use it or any other
> when setting up the nut staggers. Standard equal temperment only
> and you need a good chromatic tuner)
>

> Because that guitar plays better than all the others, (and it has worn
> out frets!) I decided to do this with my favorite 87 Anderson strat
> that has new stainless steel frets (which I LOVE) on it.
>
> I didn't want to do the whole glue-on leetle pieces of pick routine,
> and it looks goofy anyway, so here's what I did:
>
> (this only works on strats. I have not tried it on anything else yet)
>
> --PLEASE don't try this if you care about your guitar's resale value--
>
> Also, this requires significant luthery skills (woodworking etc) if
> you are not sure you can do this, you can ruin your neck!
>
> You get a Gibson nut blank form StewMac.
>
> http://www.stewmac.com/shop/Nuts,_saddles/String_nuts/Graph_Tech_Nuts.html
>
> #1868
>
> It is 3/16 wide as opposed to the 1/8 of strats. You inlet the
> fingerboard
> in the direction of the body only, to make the nut slot
> wider for the new nut.
>
> All of the extra width must be in the direction of the
> body! (Please, if you can't do a beautiful job of inletting the
> fingerboard, take it to a repair guy who can!)
>
>
> In a few words, you file the new, wider nut back towards the
> headstock to match the needs of each string. (using the tuner)
>
> Use new strings of the kind you always
> use, since this will not be right when you change brands / gauges.
>
> You end up with a staggered nut that perfectly matches your
> guitar, frets and strings.
>
> Oh yes, you will hear the difference.
>
> I have left out lots of important details, and you need some
> really nice tools to do this, so don't go grabbing the files
> just yet.
>
> Did I mention that it is a LOT of work to do this right? Well it is.
> I have a lot of guitar tools, and I bought 120.00 more from various
> sources, and it still took me almost 2 days...

>
> I intend to show Dan at Top Gear how I did this, and if he likes the
> idea he may offer it as a service. Expect it to cost a few bucks.
>
> More to follow.
>
> DCOh my gawd, lucifer!
either way, it's so absurd,
look around it's
such a blur you see!!

Why is live and let live so hard? I dunno. Seems so easy.

I've taken to burying my head in the sand. Ignorance is bliss
sort of nearly almost. It'll all work out in the end (except
for those of us burning in hell for eternity...OUCH!)

Sarah, I listened to the clips on your site...very very
nice Paris sound. Thumbs up!

Peace brothers and sisters!!

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>(heavy sigh) I'm not sure why I'm continuing with this . . . I learned

>years ago you can't argue with a religious person. Yet I feel compelled
to
>make my views clear to you, since you are pretty much consistently wrong
in
>your assumptions about what I'm saying. I think you're still trying to
view
>me as a "type" rather than just as that unique thing I like to call "me."
>
>First of all, the term "blind faith" is pretty much redundant. Faith is

>essentially, by definition, blind. Faith is "belief that does not rest
on
>logical proof or material evidence." You can have your own definition if

>you need to, but that's from the dictionary, and makes sense to me. If
you
>have proof or evidence, it's not longer a belief, is it? I believe in
>gravity, even though I can't explain it to you. It's obviously,
>demonstrably, and universally agreeably real.
>
>Second, I am not saying God is unknowable . . . I'm saying I personally
do
>not know who or what created this universe or when or why, and I see no

>evidence that anyone else does either, in spite of their fervent claims.
I
>do believe in a higher power which is very exhilarating to feel truly
>connected to, but the attempts of religion in general to describe this
>"supreme being" anthropomorphically just strike me as very superficial and

>frankly, kind of childish. I put "God" in quotes because I think it's silly

>to try and turn this awesome everpresent life force into a "guy in the sky."

>I do not "blind" myself with this point of view. Quite the opposite, my

>mind is wide open to spiritual experience, not limited to ancient dogma
that
>I have no reason to believe.
>
>Which leads me to the real point I was hoping to make in fewer words: I

>have been arguing these ideas with believers since I was 17 (LONG time ago),

>and in all that time not ONE of them has given me a REASON to believe that

>the bible is anything more than legend, parable, mythology, and a smattering

>of history. I should believe it's the word of God why? Because it claims

>to be? Those are the claims of Roman bishops and other ancient human beings

>whose motives and honesty I know nothing about. And if the bible is the

>word of God, I'm not impressed. I expect better from a supreme being.
>
>Like the dozens before you, you tell me repeatedly what you believe in a
way
>that suggests no opposing belief can possibly be true. I know WHAT you

>believe, I've heard it a thousand times over the last 30-some years. What
I
>don't know is WHY you believe it. Because it gives you hope? Because you

>were desperate for answers and a bible was handy? Because your parents

>believed it? Because you dropped acid and saw Jesus? Because you happened

>to be born here rather than India or Iran? And if you had been born in

>India or Iran, would you be just as fervently Hindu or Muslim?

>
>Nor has anyone ever been able to explain the logic in a supposedly
>omnipotent being sending his son to die for our sins. How does this make

>any sense? Isn't it more likely that Jesus simply became enough of a threat

>to the Romans and the Jewish heirarchy that they decided to kill him?
>
>You speak a lot about assumptions. OK, here's one you seem to share with

>other believers that drives me nuts: without God there is no right or
>wrong. This is such nonsense. One does not need to believe in God, Heaven,

>or Hell to know the difference between right and wrong and to behave
>accordingly. "A man's ethical behavior should be based effectually on

>sympathy, education, and social ties and needs; no religious basis is
>necessary. Man would indeed be in a poor way if he had to be restrained
by
>fear of punishment and hope of reward after death." - Albert Einstein
>
>And finally, I didn't mention "ghouls and head choppers" because the evil
of
>"ghouls and head choppers" is not in dispute. I'm concerned about what
has
>been done and is being done in my name as an American, because I believe

>that to also be evil and I'm just a little more than worried about the
>potential consequences of this.
>
>But I have to be honest . . . I feel like I just wasted another hour that
I
>could have been catching up on sleep in. I should have learned by now that

>the more you challenge fixed beliefs, the harder the believer clings to

>them. You are of course free to believe what you want, but again, beliefs

>are by definition unproven, and therefore someone else's beliefs are not

>wrong simply because they contradict yours.
>
>OK, I mean it this time . . . I give up.
>
>Sarah
>
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinmaui.com> wrote in message news:44e23a46\$1@linux...

>>
>> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>>>The problem with blind faith is that one risks being blinded by faith.
>>>(Speaking from personal experience).
>>
>> Faith in God is not blind. What is blind is the choice to call God
>> unknowable. That is a choice to remain blind, and its source is
>> solely and admittedly, human. Your assumption is that all views are
>> human at the source.
>>
>> I disagree emphatically.
>>
>> Everything proceeds from one's assumptions. Even considering
>> that the creator cared enough to send his son to die for us,
>> changes the whole world. Scary huh?
>>
>>
>>>Perhaps the only thing "God" ever said to us was "Survive!" and then left
>> it
>>>up to us to figure out that cooperation works better than competition.
>>
>>
>> If God is in quotes for you, then why would "god's" opinion
>> matter? Well it doesn't of course. Survive, don't survive, bake
>> cookies, bake Jews, who is to say no? Why should anyone care if
>> they do? All is permitted.
>>
>> This is not God's plan for us.
>>
>>
>>>The
>>>"Golden Rule" is not simply a nice idea, it's a very practical and
>>>effective
>>
>>>way to live peacefully with our fellow humans.
>>
>> And the greedy dirtbag says "the one with the gold makes the
>> rules".
>>
>> And you disapprove. With only "god" (otherwise known as Sarah's
>> opinion) to rebut him, why should he care?
>>
>>
>>>As far as speculating on the afterlife, I just don't care. I'm fine with
>>
>>>the mystery, in fact, I like a good mystery. Sure, it can be fun to say
>>
>>>"what if this . . . " or "what if that . . . " but let's be honest here

>> --
>>>none of us will know until the time comes, and maybe not even then. And
>> I'm
>>>sorry, but "because the bible tells me so" doesn't work for me. It's
just
>>
>>>stuff that was written by the brighter members of some fairly backward

>>>human
>>
>>>societies thousands of years ago who may or may not have been inspired
by
>> a
>>>supreme being.
>>
>>
>> And you cannot see that this is merely your view, not fact.
>> It is an assertion that there are no miracles, that God does not
>> care if we have a way to know Him or not, that things proceeded in
>> the past as they do today, and Jesus' death and resurrection are
>> human myths created, as all "god talk" is, by humans to comfort
>> themselves...
>>
>> You may not be an atheist, but you accept *all* of their basic
>> assumptions about existence.
>>
>>
>>>Meanwhile, back to the original topic: picture 100,000 dead Iraqis
>>>(conservative estimate). Picture them all together in a pile. What do
>> you
>>>think . . . would it fill a football stadium, like a big bowl of brown

>>>rice?
>>
>>>I don't know, but now tell me how many of those were terrorists? 100?
>> 500?
>>>1000? It doesn't matter does it? Not to those who were innocent and

>>>their
>>
>>>families.
>>>
>>>Now picture 2500 dead American soldiers and the 62,000 wounded or maimed.
>>
>>>If we were lied into this "war" based on hidden agendas, I can think of
>> some
>>>heads of state whose heads should roll. They probably won't, but it's
a

>>
 >>>nice thought. Picture Bush, Cheney, and Rumsfeld in orange jumpsuits
 and
 >>
 >>>chains . . . ni-i-i-i-ice. I feel better.
 >>>
 >>>Sarah
 >>
 >>
 >> And it is this view that concerns me that we, as a people, are no
 >> longer able to protect freedom. There were innocents killed in all
 >> wars. This is no different. Would you broadcast from Dresden
 >> or Nagasaki calling for the jailing of Truman? By your rules, you
 >> would have to.
 >>
 >> We now have a whole generation of people who cannot bring themselves to
 do
 >> what they must to protect our way of life.
 >> Given that we face the most evil and implacable enemy in many
 >> years, I am not sure that we will retain the freedom that those
 >> WWII vets you admire so much, fought and died for.
 >>
 >> And finally, notice please, not one word of condemnation for the
 >> ghouls and head choppers. Those who would use baby bottles
 >> for binary explosives and die, with their infant in their arms, to kill
 >> some of us. Not one word. This is why you simply are not
 >> convincing me here. It is selective pacifism, pointed only at
 >> Israel and the west and there is no righteousness in it.
 >>
 >> DC
 >>
 >>
 >>
 >
 >Correct me if I'm wrong here, but isn't the 'studio industry' in fairly big
 trouble? Also, in my two lines of work, writer and IT consultant, I think
 that the client should be treated with a great deal of respect. After all,
 the client keeps my lights turned on and gas in my car and my greens fees
 paid. Are you guys all making so much money that you can treat your employers
 like shit and get away with it? Wish I had that job . . .

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>gene Lennon wrote:

>> "Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> I have a few potential clients that would like to sit in on a session
 while

>>> I mix their tracks. I figure this will take extra time so it seems fair
 >>> to charge an hourly rate on top of the flat fee for the mix.

>>>
>>> Any ideas?
>>>
>>> Jesse
>>
>>
>> What you need is a big sign in your control room.
>>
>>
>> _____
>> MIX RATES
>>

>> You Watch - \$35/hour
>> You Comment - \$50/hour
>> You Help - \$100/hour
>> _____
>>

>That made me laugh. Thanks.Ya know.....as much as you and I seem to disagree at times, it's truly amazing how similarly we view things.

Regards,

Deej

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:44e369e2@linux...

> (heavy sigh) I'm not sure why I'm continuing with this . . . I learned
> years ago you can't argue with a religious person. Yet I feel compelled
to
> make my views clear to you, since you are pretty much consistently wrong
in
> your assumptions about what I'm saying. I think you're still trying to
view
> me as a "type" rather than just as that unique thing I like to call "me."
>
> First of all, the term "blind faith" is pretty much redundant. Faith is
> essentially, by definition, blind. Faith is "belief that does not rest on
> logical proof or material evidence." You can have your own definition if
> you need to, but that's from the dictionary, and makes sense to me. If
you
> have proof or evidence, it's not longer a belief, is it? I believe in
> gravity, even though I can't explain it to you. It's obviously,
> demonstrably, and universally agreeably real.
>
> Second, I am not saying God is unknowable . . . I'm saying I personally do
> not know who or what created this universe or when or why, and I see no
> evidence that anyone else does either, in spite of their fervent claims.

I

- > do believe in a higher power which is very exhilarating to feel truly
- > connected to, but the attempts of religion in general to describe this
- > "supreme being" anthropomorphically just strike me as very superficial and
- > frankly, kind of childish. I put "God" in quotes because I think it's silly
- > to try and turn this awesome everpresent life force into a "guy in the sky."
- > I do not "blind" myself with this point of view. Quite the opposite, my
- > mind is wide open to spiritual experience, not limited to ancient dogma that
- > I have no reason to believe.
- >
- > Which leads me to the real point I was hoping to make in fewer words: I
- > have been arguing these ideas with believers since I was 17 (LONG time ago),
- > and in all that time not ONE of them has given me a REASON to believe that
- > the bible is anything more than legend, parable, mythology, and a smattering
- > of history. I should believe it's the word of God why? Because it claims
- > to be? Those are the claims of Roman bishops and other ancient human beings
- > whose motives and honesty I know nothing about. And if the bible is the
- > word of God, I'm not impressed. I expect better from a supreme being.
- >
- > Like the dozens before you, you tell me repeatedly what you believe in a way
- > that suggests no opposing belief can possibly be true. I know WHAT you
- > believe, I've heard it a thousand times over the last 30-some years. What I
- > don't know is WHY you believe it. Because it gives you hope? Because you
- > were desperate for answers and a bible was handy? Because your parents
- > believed it? Because you dropped acid and saw Jesus? Because you happened
- > to be born here rather than India or Iran? And if you had been born in
- > India or Iran, would you be just as fervently Hindu or Muslim?
- >
- > Nor has anyone ever been able to explain the logic in a supposedly
- > omnipotent being sending his son to die for our sins. How does this make
- > any sense? Isn't it more likely that Jesus simply became enough of a threat
- > to the Romans and the Jewish heirarchy that they decided to kill him?
- >
- > You speak a lot about assumptions. OK, here's one you seem to share with
- > other believers that drives me nuts: without God there is no right or
- > wrong. This is such nonsense. One does not need to believe in God, Heaven,
- > or Hell to know the difference between right and wrong and to behave

> accordingly. "A man's ethical behavior should be based effectually on
> sympathy, education, and social ties and needs; no religious basis is
> necessary. Man would indeed be in a poor way if he had to be restrained by
> fear of punishment and hope of reward after death." - Albert Einstein
>
> And finally, I didn't mention "ghouls and head choppers" because the evil
of
> "ghouls and head choppers" is not in dispute. I'm concerned about what
has
> been done and is being done in my name as an American, because I believe
> that to also be evil and I'm just a little more than worried about the
> potential consequences of this.
>
> But I have to be honest . . . I feel like I just wasted another hour that
I
> could have been catching up on sleep in. I should have learned by now
that
> the more you challenge fixed beliefs, the harder the believer clings to
> them. You are of course free to believe what you want, but again, beliefs
> are by definition unproven, and therefore someone else's beliefs are not
> wrong simply because they contradict yours.
>
> OK, I mean it this time . . . I give up.
>
> Sarah
>
>
>
> "DC" <dc@spammersinmaui.com> wrote in message news:44e23a46\$1@linux...
> >
> > "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
> >>The problem with blind faith is that one risks being blinded by faith.
> >>(Speaking from personal experience).
> >
> > Faith in God is not blind. What is blind is the choice to call God
> > unknowable. That is a choice to remain blind, and its source is
> > solely and admittedly, human. Your assumption is that all views are
> > human at the source.
> >
> > I disagree emphatically.
> >
> > Everything proceeds from one's assumptions. Even considering
> > that the creator cared enough to send his son to die for us,
> > changes the whole world. Scary huh?
> >
> >
> >>Perhaps the only thing "God" ever said to us was "Survive!" and then
left
> > it

> > > up to us to figure out that cooperation works better than competition.

> >

> >

> > If God is in quotes for you, then why would "god's" opinion

> > matter? Well it doesn't of course. Survive, don't survive, bake

> > cookies, bake Jews, who is to say no? Why should anyone care if

> > they do? All is permitted.

> >

> > This is not God's plan for us.

> >

> >

> > > The

> > > "Golden Rule" is not simply a nice idea, it's a very practical and

> > > effective

> >

> > > way to live peacefully with our fellow humans.

> >

> > And the greedy dirtbag says "the one with the gold makes the

> > rules".

> >

> > And you disapprove. With only "god" (otherwise known as Sarah's

> > opinion) to rebut him, why should he care?

> >

> >

> > > As far as speculating on the afterlife, I just don't care. I'm fine

with

> >

> > > the mystery, in fact, I like a good mystery. Sure, it can be fun to say

> >

> > > "what if this . . . " or "what if that . . . " but let's be honest here

> > --

> > > none of us will know until the time comes, and maybe not even then. And

> > I'm

> > > sorry, but "because the bible tells me so" doesn't work for me. It's

just

> >

> > > stuff that was written by the brighter members of some fairly backward

> > > human

> >

> > > societies thousands of years ago who may or may not have been inspired

by

> > a

> > > supreme being.

> >

> >

> > And you cannot see that this is merely your view, not fact.

> > It is an assertion that there are no miracles, that God does not

> > care if we have a way to know Him or not, that things proceeded in

> > the past as they do today, and Jesus' death and resurrection are
> > human myths created, as all "god talk" is, by humans to comfort
> > themselves...
> >
> > You may not be an atheist, but you accept *all* of their basic
> > assumptions about existence.
> >
> >
> >>Meanwhile, back to the original topic: picture 100,000 dead Iraqis
> >>(conservative estimate). Picture them all together in a pile. What do
> > you
> >>think . . . would it fill a football stadium, like a big bowl of brown
> >>rice?
> >
> >>I don't know, but now tell me how many of those were terrorists? 100?
> > 500?
> >>1000? It doesn't matter does it? Not to those who were innocent and
> >>their
> >
> >>families.
> >>
> >>Now picture 2500 dead American soldiers and the 62,000 wounded or
maimed.
> >
> >>If we were lied into this "war" based on hidden agendas, I can think of
> > some
> >>heads of state whose heads should roll. They probably won't, but it's a
> >
> >>nice thought. Picture Bush, Cheney, and Rumsfeld in orange jumpsuits
and
> >
> >>chains . . . ni-i-i-i-ice. I feel better.
> >>
> >>Sarah
> >
> >
> > And it is this view that concerns me that we, as a people, are no
> > longer able to protect freedom. There were innocents killed in all
> > wars. This is no different. Would you broadcast from Dresden
> > or Nagasaki calling for the jailing of Truman? By your rules, you
> > would have to.
> >
> > We now have a whole generation of people who cannot bring themselves to
do
> > what they must to protect our way of life.
> > Given that we face the most evil and implacable enemy in many
> > years, I am not sure that we will retain the freedom that those
> > WWII vets you admire so much, fought and died for.

> >
> > And finally, notice please, not one word of condemnation for the
> > ghouls and head choppers. Those who would use baby bottles
> > for binary explosives and die, with their infant in their arms, to kill
> > some of us. Not one word. This is why you simply are not
> > convincing me here. It is selective pacifism, pointed only at
> > Israel and the west and there is no righteousness in it.

> >

> > DC

> >

> >

> >

>

>Hehe you might be right as he hasnt emailed me back ;-)

Maybe I'll follow up and let him know I didn't mean he'd be charged. I told him the fee for the mix and that I also offer training at \$30 an hour (which insinuated I'd charge him to sit in). But maybe I can reverse the outcome so far.

Jesse

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

>

>Oh boy.. I wish!!

>

>Wouldn't that be cool. But if you do so, you will lose the client

>IMO.

>

>You can, of course, lay down some rules about talking and giving

>you constant advice while you are eq'ing a soloed track...

>

>"Oh, the mix went away!! It was so good a minute ago and now

>the guitar is too loud!"

>

>grrrrrr

>

>DC

>

>

>"Jesse Skeens" <jskeens@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>I have a few potential clients that would like to sit in on a session while
&

Subject: Re: Any know of a good way to sync an Adrenaline to paris?

Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 23:29:07 GMT

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

k">nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>Correct me if I'm wrong here, but isn't the 'studio industry' in fairly big

>trouble? Also, in my two lines of work, writer and IT consultant, I think

>that the client should be treated with a great deal of respect. After all,

>the client keeps my lights turned on and gas in my car and my greens fees

>paid. Are you guys all making so much money that you can treat your employers

>like shit and get away with it? Wish I had that job . . .

I get your point and that's why I asked why. My studio is generally not populated with clients as most of my mixing and masterign work is done over the internet. But I also teach at a school here in Orlando (guess) and one of my students emailed me about this.

My reasoning was that I charge the same amount to others that don't have the benefi

Subject: Re: Any know of a good way to sync an Adrenaline to paris?

Posted by [Rod Lincoln](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 00:29:32 GMT

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

ank">44e3ae02@linux...

>

> One of the biggest challenges we face is how to have constructive dialog

> between people who operate from very different assumptions about the

> nature of reality.

>

> Great post, Sarah.

>

> Cheers,

> -Jamie

> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

>

>

> Sarah wrote:

> > (heavy sigh) I'm not sure why I'm continuing with this . . . I learned

> > years ago you can't argue with a religious person. Yet I feel compelled to

> > make my views clear to you, since you are pretty much consistently wrong in

> > your assumptions about what I'm saying. I think you're still trying to view

> > me as a "type" rather than just as that unique thing I like to call

"me."

> >

> > First of all, the term "blind faith" is pretty much redundant. Faith is

> > essentially, by definition, blind. Faith is "belief that does not rest

on

> > logical proof or material evidence." You can have your own definition

if

> > you need to, but that's from the dictionary, and makes sense to me. If

you

> > have p

Subject: Re: Any know of a good way to sync an Adrenaline to paris?

Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Thu, 06 Jul 2006 01:39:46 GMT

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

and saw Jesus? Because you

happened

> > to be born here rather than India or Iran? And if you had been born in

> > India or Iran, would you be just as fervently Hindu or Muslim?

> >

> > Nor has anyone ever been able to explain the logic in a supposedly

> > omnipotent being sending his son to die for our sins. How does this

make

> > any sense? Isn't it more likely that Jesus simply became enough of a
threat

> > to the Romans and the Jewish heirarchy that they decided to kill him?

> >

> > You speak a lot about assumptions. OK, here's one you seem to share with

> > other believers that drives me nuts: without God there is no right or

> > wrong. This is such nonsense. One does not need to believe in God,

Heaven,

> > or Hell to know the difference between right and wrong and to behave

> > accordingly. "A man's e
