

---

Subject: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up

Posted by [Neil](#) on Thu, 20 Apr 2006 02:56:43 GMT

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

---

OK, as I said, I had written to Aleksey @ Voxengo on y'all's behalf to see if he could write said type of plugin, and unfortunately, he doesn't think he could do it.... here is his response pasted in below:

\*\*\*Hello,

One person already asked me to make such plug-in. But I have declined due to possible unsolvable technical problems. I'm still not much interested in such project. I suggest you to contact other developers - especially those who already have VST plug-in host working.

Best regards,

Aleksey\*\*\*

OK, so one down.. NEXT??? May I suggest contacting someone who works at Swineberg since they're the VST guru's anyway? Perhaps they could do it as a side project if they don't have a non-compete clause in their contract? Or perhaps someone who USED to work at Swineberg?

Just trying to toss out viable ideas.

Neil

---

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Thu, 20 Apr 2006 03:02:26 GMT

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

---

Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing this as balancing a pole on a goat.

;o)

..

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4446f86b\$1@linux...

>

> OK, as I said, I had written to Aleksey @ Voxengo on y'all's

> behalf to see if he could write said type of plugin, and

> unfortunately, he doesn't think he could do it.... here is his

> response pasted in below:

>

> \*\*\*Hello,

> One person already asked me to make such plug-in. But I have declined due

> to possible unsolvable technical problems. I'm still not much interested  
> in such project. I suggest you to contact other developers - especially  
those  
> who already have VST plug-in host working.  
> Best regards,  
> Aleksey\*\*\*  
>  
> OK, so one down.. NEXT??? May I suggest contacting someone who  
> works at Swineberg since they're the VST guru's anyway? Perhaps  
> they could do it as a side project if they don't have a non-  
> compete clause in their contract? Or perhaps someone who USED  
> to work at Swineberg?  
>  
> Just trying to toss out viable ideas.  
>  
> Neil

---

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up  
Posted by [thesandbox](#) on Thu, 20 Apr 2006 03:36:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Just a conspiracy theory I have always wondered.....has anyone ever thought if Digi had some sort of deal to kill PARIS.  
i.e... Payoff to EMU or Int. Devices to make sure there was no competition for them. Ever wondered why the new EMU audio systems "have the same converters as the Digi 192 I/O" and for some unknown reason to the rest of us that the PARIS code is not released or still "under development". Maybe some sort of time frame for a non-competitive agreement or such. Enough to keep PT as the monopoly. At the time before HD was coming out it seems PARIS could have really taken some of their market share if done right. I am sure they have enough money from all of their "upgrades" to make someone be quiet for a while. Just a thought.....

Matt Barber

"DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote:  
>Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing this  
>as balancing a pole on a goat.  
>  
>;o)  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>"Neil" <[OIUOIU@OIU.com](mailto:OIUOIU@OIU.com)> wrote in message [news:4446f86b\\$1@linux...](news:4446f86b$1@linux...)  
>>  
>> OK, as I said, I had written to Aleksey @ Voxengo on y'all's  
>> behalf to see if he could write said type of plugin, and

>> unfortunately, he doesn't think he could do it.... here is his  
>> response pasted in below:  
>>  
>> \*\*\*Hello,  
>> One person already asked me to make such plug-in. But I have declined  
due  
>> to possible unsolvable technical problems. I'm still not much interested  
>> in such project. I suggest you to contact other developers - especially  
>those  
>> who already have VST plug-in host working.  
>> Best regards,  
>> Aleksey\*\*\*  
>>  
>> OK, so one down.. NEXT??? May I suggest contacting someone who  
>> works at Swineberg since they're the VST guru's anyway? Perhaps  
>> they could do it as a side project if they don't have a non-  
>> compete clause in their contract? Or perhaps someone who USED  
>> to work at Swineberg?  
>>  
>> Just trying to toss out viable ideas.  
>>  
>> Neil  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up  
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Thu, 20 Apr 2006 04:26:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Can't say on Creative's side with any certainty - and let me be clear, I do not personally know anyone of stature there or at ID - but my thoughts are that SSC definitely doesn't need Digi's \$\$, and he was pretty proud of his baby. I feel fairly confident that Creative just had no clue about how to handle it Emu didn't have the resources and made mistakes in the takeover (Major mistakes at Emu/Creative: never poop on your own doorstep fellas, that includes firing the engineers and throwing on a coat of paint/rebadging a name/jacking up the price on a product already in trouble) and Ensoniq just plain didn't have the funds to market it right.  
Just my opinions though.  
AA

"thesandbox" <matt@sandboxproductions.com> wrote in message  
news:444701be\$1@linux...

>  
> Just a conspiracy theory I have always wondered.....has anyone ever  
> thought

> if Digi had some sort of deal to kill PARIS.  
> i.e... Payoff to EMU or Int. Devices to make sure there was no competition  
> for them. Ever wondered why the new EMU audio systems "have the same  
> converters  
> as the Digi 192 I/O" and for some unknown reason to the rest of us that  
> the  
> PARIS code is not released or still "under development". Maybe some sort  
> of time frame for a non-competitive agreement or such. Enough to keep PT as  
> the monopoly. At the time before HD was coming out it seems PARIS could  
> have really taken some of their market share if done right. I am sure  
> they  
> have enough money from all of their "upgrades" to make someone be quiet  
> for  
> a while. Just a thought.....  
>  
> Matt Barber  
>  
> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>>Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing this  
>>as balancing a pole on a goat.  
>>  
>>;o)  
>>.  
>>  
>>  
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4446f86b\$1@linux...  
>>>  
>>> OK, as I said, I had written to Aleksey @ Voxengo on y'all's  
>>> behalf to see if he could write said type of plugin, and  
>>> unfortunately, he doesn't think he could do it.... here is his  
>>> response pasted in below:  
>>>  
>>> \*\*\*Hello,  
>>> One person already asked me to make such plug-in. But I have declined  
> due  
>>> to possible unsolvable technical problems. I'm still not much interested  
>>> in such project. I suggest you to contact other developers - especially  
>>those  
>>> who already have VST plug-in host working.  
>>> Best regards,  
>>> Aleksey\*\*\*  
>>>  
>>> OK, so one down.. NEXT??? May I suggest contacting someone who  
>>> works at Swineberg since they're the VST guru's anyway? Perhaps  
>>> they could do it as a side project if they don't have a non-  
>>> compete clause in their contract? Or perhaps someone who USED  
>>> to work at Swineberg?  
>>>

>>> Just trying to toss out viable ideas.  
>>>  
>>> Neil  
>>  
>>  
>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?  
<http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>

---

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Thu, 20 Apr 2006 15:34:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I agree Aaron. PARIS was just a victim of bad business decisions all the way around.

Tony

"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message news:44470cad@linux...

> Can't say on Creative's side with any certainty - and let me be clear, I  
> do not personally know anyone of stature there or at ID - but my thoughts  
> are that SSC definitely doesn't need Digi's \$\$, and he was pretty proud of  
> his baby. I feel fairly confident that Creative just had no clue about how  
> to handle it Emu didn't have the resources and made mistakes in the  
> takeover (Major mistakes at Emu/Creative: never poop on your own doorstep  
> fellas, that includes firing the engineers and throwing on a coat of  
> paint/rebadging a name/jacking up the price on a product already in  
> trouble) and Ensoniq just plain didn't have the funds to market it right.  
> Just my opinions though.

> AA

>

>

> "thesandbox" <matt@sandboxproductions.com> wrote in message  
> news:444701be\$1@linux...

>>

>> Just a conspiracy theory I have always wondered.....has anyone ever  
>> thought

>> if Digi had some sort of deal to kill PARIS.

>> i.e... Payoff to EMU or Int. Devices to make sure there was no

>> competition

>> for them. Ever wondered why the new EMU audio systems "have the same

>> converters

>> as the Digi 192 I/O" and for some unknown reason to the rest of us that

>> the

>> PARIS code is not released or still "under development". Maybe some  
>> sort  
>> of time frame for a non-competitive agreement or such. Enough to keep PT  
>> as  
>> the monopoly. At the time before HD was coming out it seems PARIS could  
>> have really taken some of their market share if done right. I am sure  
>> they  
>> have enough money from all of their "upgrades" to make someone be quiet  
>> for  
>> a while. Just a thought.....  
>>  
>> Matt Barber  
>>  
>> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>>> Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing  
>>> this  
>>> as balancing a pole on a goat.  
>>>  
>>>;o)  
>>>.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4446f86b\$1@linux...  
>>>>  
>>>> OK, as I said, I had written to Aleksey @ Voxengo on y'all's  
>>>> behalf to see if he could write said type of plugin, and  
>>>> unfortunately, he doesn't think he could do it.... here is his  
>>>> response pasted in below:  
>>>>  
>>>> \*\*\*Hello,  
>>>> One person already asked me to make such plug-in. But I have declined  
>> due  
>>>> to possible unsolvable technical problems. I'm still not much  
>>>> interested  
>>>> in such project. I suggest you to contact other developers - especially  
>>>> those  
>>>> who already have VST plug-in host working.  
>>>> Best regards,  
>>>> Aleksey\*\*\*  
>>>>  
>>>> OK, so one down.. NEXT??? May I suggest contacting someone who  
>>>> works at Swineberg since they're the VST guru's anyway? Perhaps  
>>>> they could do it as a side project if they don't have a non-  
>>>> compete clause in their contract? Or perhaps someone who USED  
>>>> to work at Swineberg?  
>>>>  
>>>> Just trying to toss out viable ideas.  
>>>>

>>>> Neil  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>  
>  
> I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?  
> <http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up  
Posted by [JD](#) on Thu, 20 Apr 2006 19:46:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Scott E. was the guy that decided to kill Paris. If you don't know who Scott E. was, look up Paris 3.0 press releases from EMU. Paris died, not because of lack of vision, Paris died because of ego! Paris was not an EMU product, it was their former competitors product. Everybody in the company hated the Ensoniq products!!!! They couldn't wait to off load all the Ensoniq inventory, that included Paris. Ensoniq was heavily invested in to Paris, EMU ended up with that inventory. At the time Paris was worth more to EMU alive than dead, because of the inventory on hand. That is why EMU signed a short development contract with ID to continue developing the Paris software. They needed to keep Paris selling. In order to do this, they needed it to appear to everybody that they where serious about Paris and it's development. When they liquidated enough of the inventory, Scott E. killed Paris, and they did not renew their contract with ID. EMU lied to everybody about their intentions, in order to keep it all going. They never intended to develop the Paris system. There was no hardware development, it was all lies. That's the truth!

In those corporate press releases, EMU announced features that were not in Paris 3.0, or did not work. That is fraud! You can't intentionally misrepresent a product and then sell to people. Those laws are vary clear. The saddest thing is that, know it all, nay sayers, dissuaded people from filing a class action suit against EMU. Now it is probably too late. I guess you'd have to check California law. A good 100 complaints to the california attorney generals office may have made all the difference in the the world, but then again, hind sight is 20/20, and that is speculation.

"thesandbox" <[matt@sandboxproductions.com](mailto:matt@sandboxproductions.com)> wrote:

>  
>Just a conspiracy theory I have always wondered.....has anyone ever thought  
>if Digi had some sort of deal to kill PARIS.  
>i.e... Payoff to EMU or Int. Devices to make sure there was no compitition  
>for them. Ever wondered why the new EMU audio systems "have the same converters  
>as the Digi 192 I/O" and for some unknown reason to the rest of us that

the  
>PARIS code is not released or still "under development". Maybe some sort  
>of time frame for a non-competitive agreement or such. Enough to keep PT  
as  
>the monopoly. At the time before HD was coming out it seems PARIS could  
>have really taken some of their market share if done right. I am sure they  
>have enough money from all of their "upgrades" to make someone be quiet  
for  
>a while. Just a thought.....  
>  
>Matt Barber  
>  
>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>>Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing this  
>>as balancing a pole on a goat.  
>>  
>>;o)  
>>.  
>>  
>>  
>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4446f86b\$1@linux...  
>>>  
>>> OK, as I said, I had written to Aleksey @ Voxengo on y'all's  
>>> behalf to see if he could write said type of plugin, and  
>>> unfortunately, he doesn't think he could do it.... here is his  
>>> response pasted in below:  
>>>  
>>> \*\*\*Hello,  
>>> One person already asked me to make such plug-in. But I have declined  
>due  
>>> to possible unsolvable technical problems. I'm still not much interested  
>>> in such project. I suggest you to contact other developers - especially  
>>those  
>>> who already have VST plug-in host working.  
>>> Best regards,  
>>> Aleksey\*\*\*  
>>>  
>>> OK, so one down.. NEXT??? May I suggest contacting someone who  
>>> works at Swineberg since they're the VST guru's anyway? Perhaps  
>>> they could do it as a side project if they don't have a non-  
>>> compete clause in their contract? Or perhaps someone who USED  
>>> to work at Swineberg?  
>>>  
>>> Just trying to toss out viable ideas.  
>>>  
>>> Neil  
>>  
>>



>

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 20 Apr 2006 20:38:20 GMT

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

---

so they are just a normal american bend over and get screwed business

Doesn't matter wrote:

> Scott E. was the guy that decided to kill Paris. If you don't know who Scott  
> E. was, look up Paris 3.0 press releases from EMU. Paris died, not because  
> of lack of vision, Paris died because of ego! Paris was not an EMU product,  
> it was their former competitors product. Everybody in the company hated  
> the Ensoniq products!!!! They couldn't wait to off load all the Ensoniq  
> inventory, that included Paris. Ensoniq was heavily invested in to Paris,  
> EMU ended up with that inventory. At the time Paris was worth more to EMU  
> alive than dead, because of the inventory on hand. That is why EMU signed  
> a short development contract with ID to continue developing the Paris software.  
> They needed to keep Paris selling. In order to do this, they needed it  
> to appear to everybody that they where serious about Paris and it's development.  
> When they liquidated enough of the inventory, Scott E. killed Paris, and  
> they did not renew their contract with ID. EMU lied to everybody about their  
> intentions, in order to keep it all going. They never intended to develop  
> the Paris system. There was no hardware development, it was all lies. That's  
> the truth!

>

> In those corporate press releases, EMU announced features that were not in  
> Paris 3.0, or did not work. That is fraud! You can't intentionally misrepresent  
> a product and then sell to people. Those laws are vary clear. The saddest  
> thing is that, know it all, nay sayers, dissuaded people from filing a class  
> action suit against EMU. Now it is probably too late. I guess you'd have  
> to check California law. A good 100 complaints to the california attorney  
> generals office may have made all the difference in the the world, but then  
> again, hind sight is 20/20, and that is speculation.

>

> "thesandbox" <matt@sandboxproductions.com> wrote:

>> Just a conspiracy theory I have always wondered.....has anyone ever thought

>> if Digi had some sort of deal to kill PARIS.

>> i.e... Payoff to EMU or Int. Devices to make sure there was no competition

>> for them. Ever wondered why the new EMU audio systems "have the same converters

>> as the Digi 192 I/O" and for some unknown reason to the rest of us that

> the

>> PARIS code is not released or still "under development". Maybe some sort

>> of time frame for a non-competitive agreement or such. Enough to keep PT

> as

>> the monopoly. At the time before HD was coming out it seems PARIS could

>> have really taken some of their market share if done right. I am sure they

>> have enough money from all of their "upgrades" to make someone be quiet  
> for  
>> a while. Just a thought.....  
>>  
>> Matt Barber  
>>  
>> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>>> Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing this  
>>> as balancing a pole on a goat.  
>>>  
>>> ;o)  
>>> .  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4446f86b\$1@linux...  
>>>> OK, as I said, I had written to Aleksey @ Voxengo on y'all's  
>>>> behalf to see if he could write said type of plugin, and  
>>>> unfortunately, he doesn't think he could do it.... here is his  
>>>> response pasted in below:  
>>>>  
>>>> \*\*\*Hello,  
>>>> One person already asked me to make such plug-in. But I have declined  
>> due  
>>>> to possible unsolvable technical problems. I'm still not much interested  
>>>> in such project. I suggest you to contact other developers - especially  
>>> those  
>>>> who already have VST plug-in host working.  
>>>> Best regards,  
>>>> Aleksey\*\*\*  
>>>>  
>>>> OK, so one down.. NEXT??? May I suggest contacting someone who  
>>>> works at Swineberg since they're the VST guru's anyway? Perhaps  
>>>> they could do it as a side project if they don't have a non-  
>>>> compete clause in their contract? Or perhaps someone who USED  
>>>> to work at Swineberg?  
>>>>  
>>>> Just trying to toss out viable ideas.  
>>>>  
>>>> Neil  
>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up  
Posted by [Chris Latham](#) on Fri, 21 Apr 2006 01:47:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Take it from someone who owns both goats and Paris; ain't neither one of

those things ever gonna happen.

Thanks for the setup , Deej.  
CL

"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message  
news:4446fb23@linux...  
> Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing this  
> as balancing a pole on a goat.  
>  
> ;o)

---

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up  
Posted by [Chris Latham](#) on Fri, 21 Apr 2006 01:54:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Holy cow!... I mean goat. I just saw the previous header. OK, goat on a pole obviously can work, but pole on a goat, like DJ stated, is IMPOSSIBLE!

CL

"Chris Latham" <latham\_c@bellsouth.net> wrote in message  
news:4448399a@linux...  
> Take it from someone who owns both goats and Paris; ain't neither one of  
> those things ever gonna happen.  
>  
> Thanks for the setup , Deej.  
> CL  
>  
> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message  
> news:4446fb23@linux...  
> > Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing  
this  
> > as balancing a pole on a goat.  
> >  
> > ;o)  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up  
Posted by [Mike Audet](#) on Fri, 21 Apr 2006 05:47:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That was always my feeling, too. To think I bought an Emu sampler because

I felt so grateful that they kept PARIS alive. I feel dirty just thinking about it.

At least they released the source code they had.

Mike

"Doesn't matter" <no@nospam.com> wrote:

>  
>Scott E. was the guy that decided to kill Paris. If you don't know who Scott  
>E. was, look up Paris 3.0 press releases from EMU. Paris died, not because  
>of lack of vision, Paris died because of ego! Paris was not an EMU product,  
>it was their former competitors product. Everybody in the company hated  
>the Ensoniq products!!!! They couldn't wait to off load all the Ensoniq  
>inventory, that included Paris. Ensoniq was heavily invested in to Paris,  
>EMU ended up with that inventory. At the time Paris was worth more to EMU  
>alive than dead, because of the inventory on hand. That is why EMU signed  
>a short development contract with ID to continue developing the Paris software.  
> They needed to keep Paris selling. In order to do this, they needed it  
>to appear to everybody that they where serious about Paris and it's development.  
> When they liquidated enough of the inventory, Scott E. killed Paris, and  
>they did not renew their contract with ID. EMU lied to everybody about their  
>intentions, in order to keep it all going. They never intended to develop  
>the Paris system. There was no hardware development, it was all lies. That's  
>the truth!  
>  
>In those corporate press releases, EMU announced features that were not  
in  
>Paris 3.0, or did not work. That is fraud! You can't intentionally misrepresent  
>a product and then sell to people. Those laws are vary clear. The saddest  
>thing is that, know it all, nay sayers, dissuaded people from filing a class  
>action suit against EMU. Now it is probably too late. I guess you'd have  
>to check California law. A good 100 complaints to the california attorney  
>generals office may have made all the difference in the the world, but then  
>again, hind sight is 20/20, and that is speculation.  
>  
>"thesandbox" <matt@sandboxproductions.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>Just a conspiracy theory I have always wondered.....has anyone ever thought  
>>if Digi had some sort of deal to kill PARIS.  
>>i.e... Payoff to EMU or Int. Devices to make sure there was no compitition  
>>for them. Ever wondered why the new EMU audio systems "have the same converters  
>>as the Digi 192 I/O" and for some unknown reason to the rest of us that  
>the  
>>PARIS code is not released or still "under development". Maybe some sort

>>of time frame for a non-competitive agreement or such. Enough to keep PT  
>as  
>>the monopoly. At the time before HD was coming out it seems PARIS could  
>>have really taken some of their market share if done right. I am sure  
they  
>>have enough money from all of their "upgrades" to make someone be quiet  
>for  
>>a while. Just a thought.....  
>>  
>>Matt Barber  
>>  
>>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
>>>Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing  
this  
>>>as balancing a pole on a goat.  
>>>  
>>>;o)  
>>>.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:4446f86b\$1@linux...  
>>>>  
>>>> OK, as I said, I had written to Aleksey @ Voxengo on y'all's  
>>>> behalf to see if he could write said type of plugin, and  
>>>> unfortunately, he doesn't think he could do it.... here is his  
>>>> response pasted in below:  
>>>>  
>>>> \*\*\*Hello,  
>>>> One person already asked me to make such plug-in. But I have declined  
>>due  
>>>> to possible unsolvable technical problems. I'm still not much interested  
>>>> in such project. I suggest you to contact other developers - especially  
>>>>those  
>>>> who already have VST plug-in host working.  
>>>> Best regards,  
>>>> Aleksey\*\*\*  
>>>>  
>>>> OK, so one down.. NEXT??? May I suggest contacting someone who  
>>>> works at Swineberg since they're the VST guru's anyway? Perhaps  
>>>> they could do it as a side project if they don't have a non-  
>>>> compete clause in their contract? Or perhaps someone who USED  
>>>> to work at Swineberg?  
>>>>  
>>>> Just trying to toss out viable ideas.  
>>>>  
>>>> Neil  
>>>>  
>>>>

>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Automatic Latency Compensator: follow-up  
Posted by [emarenot](#) on Sat, 22 Apr 2006 16:39:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

....unless you have duct tape. With duct tape, anything is possible.  
MR

"Chris Latham" <latham\_c@bellsouth.net> wrote in message  
news:44483b62@linux...

> Holy cow!... I mean goat. I just saw the previous header. OK, goat on a  
> pole obviously can work, but pole on a goat, like DJ stated, is  
IMPOSSIBLE!

>  
> CL

>  
>  
> "Chris Latham" <latham\_c@bellsouth.net> wrote in message  
> news:4448399a@linux...

>> Take it from someone who owns both goats and Paris; ain't neither one of  
>> those things ever gonna happen.

>>  
>> Thanks for the setup , Deej.  
>> CL

>>  
>> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote in message  
>> news:4446fb23@linux...

>>> Without the Paris code, I think there's about as much chance of doing  
> this

>>> as balancing a pole on a goat.

>>>  
>>> ;o)

>>  
>>  
>  
>