

---

Subject: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)  
Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 10:10:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

a>  
>  
> How could we solve the flanging?  
>  
> COuld we say, copy all the drum tracks to an adjacent 7 group of tracks,  
> slide em ahead, than sample slide back (Like UAD1 Situation) them before  
> sending em to th

---

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)  
Posted by [nope](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 14:13:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

gt;  
> >1.You put stereo compressor EDS on AUX1.  
> >2.You put on every drumtrack you wanna compress the aux1 in prefader  
status  
> >and control with auxe's panpot level the place you wanna put it in the  
> >stereo field.  
> >3.You push the fader all the way down -90 as to not have flanging on your  
> >drumsounds.  
> >4. You control indivindual drumlevels from Aux1 level knob and pannong  
from  
> >panpot knob.  
> >  
> >5. For you comressor output level you have that on Auxe's 1 return knob  
> >with panpot again possibilities.  
> >6. For EQ you put after the stereo compressor in aux1 the FreakQ wh

---

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)  
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 14:24:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ich is  
> >also stereo to have control over frequencies.  
> >  
> >7. That makes me happy as opposed to using UAD1  
> >  
> >Regards,  
> >Dimitrios  
> >  
> >

>Looks extremely ugly right now. One levee failed in the 9th ward and the south levee of Ponchatrain breached with the lake starting to spill into the north side of the city.. People on their roofs in hurricane force winds because their houses are flooded up to the eaves.

They're gonna be wrangling gators and snakes in the French Quarter tomorrow.

"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:43131f4e\$1@linux...

>

> For any and all effected by, or in the path of this hurricane -our thoughts

> and prayers are with you. Stay safe.

> MR"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message news:

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)

Posted by [BRAD LUND](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 14:25:22 GMT

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

---

target="\_blank">43132d9f@linux...

> They're gonna be wrangling gators and snakes in the French Quarter  
> tomorrow.

gonna be some drunkass reptiles :)Ok,

Here is the other way of doing it .

You have only to move the original auxed drumtracks.

First you copy the drumtracks to adjastend tracks.

Then you aux the non copied with Stereo compressor as I detaled before.

Then you put faders at minimum -90 position for those drumtracks.

They now serve only for aux feeding.

Now you nudge them by 5ms to the left and put sampledelay on Native slot and

put a 4 sample latency there (remember the aux procedure needs 236 samples ,  
5ms=240-4=236)

Now all are sample accurate !

Regards,

Dimitrios

"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message news:43131153\$1@linux...

>

> How could we solve the flanging?

>

> COuld we say, copy all the drum tracks to an adjacent 7 group of tracks,

> slide em ahead, than sample slide back (Like UAD1 Situation) them before

> sending em to the AUX1? Then tuck em under the original drumtracks?

>

> would sample slide be before the Aux send?



Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)

Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 22:50:28 GMT

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

---

;>>>>

>>>>>I've just bought these 2 x 250Gig drives. Plus my old 120Gig is still in

>>>>>the box, in addition to my old old 27Gig... all up that's... err...

>>>>> 647Gig!

>>>>>

>>>>>Surely somebody here has a terrabyte in their Paris box? :o)

>>>>>

>>>>>Cheers,

>>>>>Kim.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>No insults. Check your facts before posting.

If your belief in Darwin is based on facts and evidence, then it is open to questioning by facts and evidence. If it is based upon a faith that cannot be questioned (i.e. Darwinism) then is it indeed belief and is a religion, not science.

So, if you believe Darwin is right, then you have no problem with looking at evidence right?

But if my questioning Darwin is insulting people, do you have a religion. Looks to me like you do.

Either way, no one was insulted, at least not by me.

DC

"uptown jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>You started with the insults, Don. It is Don, right? I'm sorry if I'm

>mistaken....

>

>I vote we refrain from from any further rabid little partisan jabs.

>

>You used a jokey, silly post by one of the best-natured members of this  
>forum to deride a very large group of humans who do not share your belief  
>system. That is inappropriate behavior, at best, given the very specific  
>nature of this forum, and especially given the general good nature of those  
>who post here.

>

>Jimmy  
>  
>  
>"DC" <dc@sayitaintso.org> wrote in message news:4313485e\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> "Gary Flanigan" <garyf\_94103@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>  
>> >Darwin's theory is showing no signs of becoming less authoritative,  
>except  
>> >in the minds of the rabidly superstitious folks who comprise the American  
>> Taliban.  
>>  
>>  
&g

---

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)  
Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 23:09:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

;:>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>"Gary Flanigan" <garyf\_94103@yahoo.com> wrote:

>I'm not aware of any real scientific challenge. People are entitled to  
>their  
>faith, but the Intelligent Design folks are just promoting Creationism under  
>another name. There was a very good column in yesterday's NY Times pointing  
>out that the folks promoting this admit themselves that they have put forward  
>no scientific case. If people believe in this, fine, but it should be taught  
>at home or at their churches.

Gary, it just isn't so. ID does not ask religious questions. it asks  
scientific questions about the claims of Darwinism relating to  
life's origins and existence. Creation Science attempts to derive  
a complete scientific worldview from the Bible.

They are very different.

ID will not necessarily lead to any personal belief, but it is carving  
deeply into the Naturalistic philosophy that is at the heart of  
much of their version of science.

Here is a response:

Daniel Dennett's Sham Science - Jonathan Witt

Sunday's New York Times carries an op-ed by philosopher Daniel C. Dennett implying that intelligent design theory (ID) is a hoax because it lacks scientific content. In the process, Dennett uncritically perpetuates various falsehoods commonly used to prop up Darwin's outdated theory.

For example, Dennett claims that "contemporary biology has demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt" that natural selection--"a tournament of blind trial and error"--"has the power to generate breathtakingly ingenious designs." Yet natural selection has never been demonstrated to produce even one new species, much less new organs and body plans--the "ingenious designs" to which Dennett refers. Natural selection, like artificial selection, produces only minor changes in existing species.

In an attempt to provide evidence for the power of Darwinian evolution, Dennett cites the eye. He claims that "we have detailed computer models" to demonstrate how the camera-like eyes of vertebrates evolved from primitive light-sensitive spots. Yet as mathematician David Berlinski has shown, such computer models are a myth.

Dennett also writes: "All it takes is a rare accident that gives one lucky animal a mutation that improves its vision over that of its siblings." But such mutations have never been observed! No matter; Dennett's hand is faster than the eye, and he quickly concludes: "Since these lucky improvements accumulate - this was Darwin's insight - eyes can automatically get better and better and better, without any intelligent designer." Pull some imaginary mutations out of hat, wave the magic wand, and presto!

Dennett goes on to claim that the vertebrate retina is inside out, confirming "the mindlessness of the historical process." Yet as biologist Michael Denton has shown, the orientation of the  
v

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)  
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 23:35:17 GMT

he needs of Dennett's  
atheistic philosophy, but it is sham science.

-----  
Even better, here is an article, also from the NYT, about what ID  
actually is.

-----  
Design for Living The Basis for a Design Theory of Origins  
By: Michael Behe  
The New York Times  
February 7, 2005

teaching of Darwinian evolution, there has been a rush to debate the  
merits of the rival theory of intelligent design. As one of the  
scientists who have proposed design as an explanation for biological  
systems, I have found widespread confusion about what intelligent  
design is and what it is not.

First, what it isn't: the theory of intelligent design is not a religiously

based idea, even though devout people opposed to the teaching of  
evolution cite it in their arguments. For example, a critic recently  
caricatured intelligent design as the belief that if evolution occurred  
at all it could never be explained by Darwinian natural selection and  
could only have been directed at every stage by an omniscient  
creator. That's misleading. Intelligent design proponents do question  
whether random mutation and natural selection completely explain  
the deep structure of life. But they do not doubt that evolution  
occurred. And intelligent design itself says nothing about the  
religious concept of a creator.

Rather, the contemporary argument for intelligent design is based  
on physical evidence and a straightforward application of logic. The  
argument for it consists of four linked claims. The first claim is  
uncontroversial: we can often recognize the effects of design in  
nature. For example, unintelligent physical forces like plate tectonics  
and erosion seem quite sufficient to account for the origin of the  
Rocky Mountains. Yet they are not enough to explain Mount  
Rushmore.

Of course, we know who is responsible for Mount Rushmore, but  
even someone who had never heard of the monument could  
recognize it as designed. Which leads to the second claim of the  
intelligent design argument: the physical marks of design are visible

in aspects of biology. This is uncontroversial, too. The 18th-century clergyman William Paley likened living things to a watch, arguing that the workings of both point to intelligent design. Modern Darwinists disagree with Paley that the perceived design is real, but they do agree that life overwhelms us with the appearance of design.

For example, Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the structure of DNA, once wrote that biologists must constantly remind themselves that what they see was not designed but evolved. (Imagine a scientist repeating through clenched teeth: "It wasn't really designed. Not really.")

The resemblance of parts of life to engineered mechanisms like a watch is enormously stronger than what Reverend Paley imagined. In the past 50 years modern science has shown that the cell, the very foundation of life, is run by machines made of molecules. There are little molecular trucks in the cell to ferry supplies, little outboard motors to push a cell through liquid.

In 1998 an issue of the journal *Cell* was devoted to molecular machines, with articles like "The Cell as a Collection of Protein Machines" and "Mechanical Devices of the Spliceosome: Motors, Clocks, Springs and Things." Referring to his student days in the 1960's, Bruce Alberts, president of the National Academy of Sciences, wrote that "the chemistry that makes life possible is much more elaborate and sophisticated than anything we students had ever considered." In fact, Dr. Alberts remarked, the entire cell can be viewed as a factory with an elaborate network of interlocking assembly lines, each of which is composed of a set of large protein machines. He emphasized that the term machine was not some fuzzy analogy; it was meant literally.

The next claim in the argument for design is that we have no good explanation for the foundation of life that doesn't involve intelligence. Here is where thoughtful people part company. Darwinists assert that their theory can explain the appearance of design in life as the result of random mutation and natural selection acting over immense stretches of time. Some scientists, however, think the Darwinists' confidence is unjustified. They note that although natural selection can explain some a

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)  
Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 23:52:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

/>



>That is insulting, not only to the many people who don't share your  
>self-righteous religious beliefs, but also to any sensible person's sense  
of  
>social propriety.

Sorry you see it that way.

>Just chill out. It's okay to do so! It won't hurt you a bit, really! Doug  
>posted a very funny little link that some of us laughed at. There's no need  
>for any proselytizing...

No proselytizing. Doug and I were discussing issues related to  
his point. If you don't enjoy the discussion, why don't you just skip  
over those posts? Does this issue bring up things you would  
rather not think about? If so, just leave these ones unread.

>...or for insults, whether you have the intestinal fortitude to to admit  
to  
>them or not.

No insults. Some folks hold to Darwin like a religion. It is  
undeniable, and compared to calling O'Hair deranged is pretty  
mild conversation I would say.

DC

>"DC" <DC@noway.org> wrote in message news:4313971d\$

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)  
Posted by [Kim](#) on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 23:54:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

href="mailto:1@linux..." target="\_blank">1@linux...  
>>  
>> No insults. Check your facts before posting.  
>>  
>> If your belief in Darwin is based on facts and evidence, then it is  
>> open to questioning by facts and evidence. If it is based upon  
>> a faith that cannot be questioned (i.e. Darwinism)

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 30 Aug 2005 06:49:01 GMT

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

---

a client might get in a jam and need an extra

>few

>> hours to complete their project - rate goes up tomorrow! Today my rate

>just

>> went up because I might need a new car someday - probably a hydrogen fuel

>> cell car. I'm sure the Flying Spaghetti Monster would approve

>whole-noodly.

>>

>> ;-)

>>

>> Dedic

>>

>....just by the way.

Looks like this latest attempt with new HDDs and a different copy of XP has done the deed. 3rd day in and not a BSOD in sight.

Now moving on to loading Paris, and, well, everything else that's needed...

Cheers,

Kim.Not sure. Aaron might know.

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message  
news:4313adeb\$1@linux...

---

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)

Posted by [Doug Wellington](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 18:05:55 GMT

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

---

/>

> A year ago the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers proposed to study how New

> Orleans could be protected from a catastrophic hurricane, but the Bush

> administration

> ordered that the research not be undertaken. After a flood killed six

> people

> in 1995, Congress created the Southeast Louisiana Urban Flood Control

> Project,

> in which the Corps of Engineers strengthened and renovated levees and

> pumping

> stations. In early 2001, the Federal Emergency Management Agency issued a

> report stating that a hurricane striking New Orleans was one of the three

> most likely disasters in the U.S., including a terrorist attack on New

> York

> City. But by 2003 the federal funding for the flood control project  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Who's got a Terrabyte? ;o)  
Posted by [Paul Braun](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 23:40:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

s in anything. He's an Aussie, but his  
> >> pickups sound like Fullerton (or maybe Memphis) if you know  
> >> what I mean.  
> >>  
> >> Inside Paris, sometimes I simply go around editing out the spaces  
> >> between guitar parts to get the hum out if I just have to use  
> >> a guitar with a buzzy pickup on it. Lot's of work, but effective  
> >> unless the guitar is clean, and mixed way up front.  
> >>  
> >> DC  
> >>  
> >  
> >  
>It runs just fine. You need to wrap the plugs with something like the fxpansion  
wrapper so paris can see them as DX plugs...but other than that it's great.  
Rod  
"tonehouse" <[zmcleod@comcast.net](mailto:zmcleod@comcast.net)> wrote:  
>How does the UAD-1 Project pack card run with PARIS and XP system? Any  
>success/failure comments?...  
>  
>

---