

---

Subject: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming

Posted by [Time For a Revolution](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 18:16:04 GMT

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

---

essentially

- > dried up as it was drained into the Iraq war. In 2004, the Bush
- > administration
- > cut funding requested by the New Orleans district of the U.S. Army Corps
- > of Engineers for holding back the waters of Lake Pontchartrain by more
- > than
- > 80 percent. Additional cuts at the beginning of this year (for a total
- > reduction
- > in funding of 44.2 percent since 2001) forced the New Orleans district of
- > the Corps to impose a hiring freeze. The Senate had debated adding funds
- > for fixing New Orleans' levees, but it was too late.
- >
- > The New Orleans Times-Picayune, which before the hurricane published
- > a series on the federal funding problem, and whose presses are now
- > underwater,
- > reported online: "No one can say they didn't see it coming ... Now in the
- > wake of one of the worst storms ever, serious questions are being asked
- > about
- > the lack of preparation."
- >
- > The Bush administration's policy of turning over wetlands to developers
- > almost certainly also contributed to the heightened level of the storm
- > surge.
- > In 1990, a federal task force began restoring lost wetlands surrounding
- > New
- > Orleans. Every two miles of wetland between the Crescent City and the Gulf
- > reduces a surge by half a foot. Bush had promised "no net loss" of
- > wetlands,
- > a policy launched by his father's administration and bolstered by
- > President
- > Clinton. But he reversed his approach in 2003, unleashing the developers.
- > The Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency then
- > announced they could no longer protect wetlands unless they were somehow
- > related to interstate commerce.
- >
- > In response to this potential crisis, four leading environmental groups
- > conducted a joint expert study, concluding in 2004 that without wetlands
- > protection New Orleans could be devastated by an ordinary, much less a
- > Category
- > 4 or 5, hurricane. "There's no way to describe how mindless a policy that
- > is when it comes to wetlands protection," said one of the report's
- > authors.
- > The chairman of the White House's Council on Environmental Quality
- > dismissed

> the study as "highly questionable," and boasted, "Everybody loves what  
> we're  
> doing."  
>  
> "My administration's climate change policy will be science based,"  
> President  
> Bush declared in June 2001. But in 2002, when the Environmental Protection  
> Agency submitted a study on global warming to the United Nations  
> reflecting  
> its expert research, Bush derided it as "a report put out by a  
> bureaucracy,"  
> and excised the climate change assessment from the agency's annual report.  
> The next year, when the EPA issued its first comprehensive "Report on the  
> Environment," stating, "Climate change has global consequences for human  
> health and the environment," the White House simply demanded removal of  
> the  
> line and all similar conclusions. At the G-8 meeting in Scotland this  
> year,  
> Bush successfully stymied any common action on global warming. Scientists,  
> meanwhile, have continued to accumulate impressive data on the rising  
> temperature  
> of the oceans, which has produced more severe hurricanes.  
>  
> In February 2004, 60 of the nation's leading scientists, including 20  
> Nobel laureates, warned in a statement, "Restoring Scientific Integrity in  
> Policymaking": "Successful application of science has played a large part  
> in the policies that have made the United States of America the world's  
> most  
> powerful nation and its citizens increasingly prosperous and healthy ...  
> Indeed, this principle has long been adhered to by presidents and  
> administrations  
> of both parties in forming and implementing policies. The administration  
> of George W. Bush has, however, disregarded this principle ... The  
> distortion  
> of scientific knowledge for partisan political ends must cease." Bush  
> completely  
> ignored this statement.  
>  
> In the two weeks preceding the storm in the Gulf, the trumping of  
> science  
> by ideology and expertise by special interests accelerated. The Federal  
> Drug  
> Administration announced that it was postponing sale of the morning-after  
> contraceptive pill, despite overwhelming scientific evidence of its safety  
> and its approval by the FDA's scientific advisory board. The United  
> Nations  
> special envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa accused the Bush administration of  
> responsibility

> for a condom shortage in Uganda -- the result of the administration's  
> evangelical  
> Christian agenda of "abstinence." When the chief of the Bureau of Justice  
> Statistics in the Justice Department was ordered by the White House to  
> delete  
> its study that African-Americans and other minorities are subject to  
> racial  
> profiling in police traffic stops and he refused to buckle under, he was  
> forced out of his job. When the Army Corps of Engineers' chief contracting  
> oversight analyst objected to a \$7 billion no-bid contract awarded for  
> work  
> in Iraq to Halliburton (the firm at which Vice President Cheney was  
> formerly  
> CEO), she was demoted despite her superior professional ratings. At the  
> National  
> Park Service, a former Cheney aide, a political appointee lacking  
> professional  
> background, drew up a plan to overturn past environmental practices and  
> prohibit  
> any mention of evolution while allowing sale of religious materials  
> through  
> the Park Service.  
>  
> On the day the levees burst in New Orleans, Bush delivered a speech in  
> Colorado comparing the Iraq war to World War II and himself to Franklin D.  
> Roosevelt: "And he knew that the best way to bring peace and stability to  
> the region was by bringing freedom to Japan." Bush had boarded his very  
> own  
> "Streetcar Named Desire."  
>  
>No disrespect intended DJ, but your response just reinforced the stereotype  
of someone who works in the industry.

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

>  
>"gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>news:43171cbd\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> Has anyone noticed that after working five years on the new White House  
>sponsored  
>> energy bill, the U.S. Congress passed a bill that fails to reduce  
>America's  
>> dependence on oil, fails to address the threat of global warming, fails  
to  
>> make any significant new investments in clean energy, and fails to help  
>consum

---

---

Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming  
Posted by [gmmccurdy](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 18:21:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ers

>> at the gas pump.

>> What it did do includes:

>> Grants the oil and gas industries an exemption for their construction  
>activities

>> from compliance with Clean Water Act.

>> Increases America's oil dependence by 130,000 barrels of oil per day in  
>2014

>> through extending the 'dual-fuel' loophole.

>> Authorized billions in new subsidies to the oil industry. (Who are all  
>showing

>> record profits without the government bonuses.)

>> Give away billions in unrelated pork fat. (The biggest giveaway of all  
>time.)

>>

>> The list of pork fat is too long and too funny for me to list but my  
>personal

>> favorites are:

>>

>> Giving \$800 million for companies in Texas and Louisiana to compensate  
>for

>> their phase out of the gasoline additive MTBE, which studies have  
>concluded

>> contaminates ground water and causes cancer.

>> Since we will now longer allow you to poison us we will give you \$800  
>million

>> for your trouble. "Coincidentally", the Bush family has considerable  
>holdings

>> in one of the companies.

>

>FYI, MTBE is an additive that the environmental lobby \*insisted\* on the  
>refineries adding to fuel because it reduced certain emissions levels. It  
>was never tested properly before this was legislated. Turns out it was bad  
>shit and how the oil companies are being sued for it when they only did  
>it

>because it was federally mandated.

>

>> Not only opening up parts of the Alaska Wildlife Refuge, but also similar  
>> areas in Wyoming. Why Wyoming?. "Coincidentally", the Chaney family has  
>future

>>

>> Oil/mineral rights to some of this property.

>

>> There are huge natural gas reserves in Wyoming on the eastern slope of the  
>> rocky mountains. One of the biggest known ones is right outside of Glacier  
>> National park. You gotta go where the gas is to get it. The fact that Cheney

>owns mineral rights there is certainly fortunate fro Cheyney, but he's from  
>Wyoming. I doubt he moved his family there 3 or four generations ago just  
>because he knew that someday we would have high natural gas prices.  
>  
>His brother is a surveyor in this area and I have worked with him before.  
If  
>Cheyney is anything like his brother, it might be a good thing to get to  
>know him before casting stones. Yeh.....I know.....its the Halliburton  
>thing, right?  
>  
>>  
>> In 2003, if you bought a Toyota Hybrid and owned a business you would  
have  
>> received \$450 in tax reduction from the IRS because of its energy  
>efficiency.  
>> If you bought a Hummer H1 (7 miles per gallon) and owned a business, you  
>> would have received aprox. \$30,000 in tax reduction from the IRS. (Public  
>> outcry has recently forced the closure of this tax loophole.)  
>  
>Most of the folks around here who own Hummers are tree huggers. (Just a  
>little perspective)  
>  
>:o)  
>>  
>> Gene  
>>  
>> P.S. DJ - I agree. Our countries largest vulnerability is our absolute  
>reliance  
>> on our current energy model. Any time our oil sources are negatively  
>effected  
>> we go into an instant recession. This essentially enslaves us to the large  
>> foreign oil producers and causes the "need" for Big-Stick diplomacy.  
>>  
>> Unfortunately we are about to come to a critical fork in the road.  
>>  
>> The people who will profit the most will be pushing the idea that we must  
>> reduce or remove all environmental constraints on energy suppliers to  
help  
>> us achieve independence and keep our economy working. This will help make  
>> many of them even richer and will shorten the time before we completely  
>run  
>> out of US oil reserves, but will also cause tremendous health issues and  
>> will result in serious environmental impacts. Some of this already  
>started.  
>> Only a national level push for new energy sources and energy independence,  
>> similar to the 1960s push to go to the moon, will help us now.  
>> That plus having a White House and Congress that actually cares more about  
>> saving our economy then their personal wealth.

>> Gene

>>

>

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

>FYI, MTBE is an additive that the environmental lobby \*insisted\* on the  
>refineries adding to fuel because it reduced certain emissions levels. It  
>was never tested properly before this was legislated. Turns out it was bad  
>shit and how the oil companies are being sued for it when they only did  
it

>because it was federally mandated.

>

This may be true but it is an interesting perspective on the history.

The environmentalists got onboard with MTBE because the additive companies presented the information on the positive impact, while covering up known problems with cancer and ground pollution.

This was well documented in a California study funded by the California state legislature.

Naturally when presented with studies that showed significant improvement in air quality, most pro environmental groups signed on.

When the full truth came out, the oil industry backed by the first Bush White House and conservative members of congress (can you say Tom DeLay) did everything in their power to hide the facts, and then block efforts to remove the MTBE.

Now the \$800 Million bonus for lying to us, and poisoning us.

It is quite an interesting twist to blame this on the environmental movement.

GeneOr these guys... we use them for audio distribution at large scale events (street festivals and the like).

<http://www.decade.ca/>

David.

DJ wrote:

> Brandon,

>

> I would love to be able to listen to my mixes, broadcast from my DAW to the  
> radio in my car. What a great idea! I was checking these out. the most  
> affordable one has a range of 30' \*line of sight\*. Walls and metal can  
> reduce this substantially according to the specs. However, the FM38-T looks  
> like a pretty substantial beast. There is no info on what kind of input it  
> uses, but I'm guessing RCA. Do you happen to know?

>

> Think of all the CD burns you could save. Between the media savings and the  
> time it takes to burn CD's again and again, at \$200.00, the FM30-WT would  
> pay for itself PDQ if it's got a decent range. I would need about 50' and  
> for it to be able to transmit through a metal roof as my studio is upstairs,  
> the roof slopes between the back wall and my driveway and/or garage and the  
> distance to the car parked in the driveway is going to be at least 30' and

> probably a bit further.  
>  
> Put a little dead air up front to give you time to get to the car and set  
> the song to loop and you could get a real good idea of where you are with a  
> mix as far as vehicular playback goes (and probably ruin some assholes day  
> who is driving down your street with thunderbuckets cranked full out if you  
> knew the band this station was using and you wanted to \*substitute\* his  
> Gangsta' mix for a good dose of Karen Carpenter or the Osmonds).  
>  
> Of course, this is illegal so I would never dream of doing it.  
>  
> ;oP  
>  
> Deej  
>  
> "Brandon" <brandon\_goodwin@REMOVETHISsbcglobal.net> wrote in message  
> news:4316479d@linux...  
>  
>>http://www.hobbytron.com/LowPowerFMTransmitters.html  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>"RZ" <pearlmusic@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message news:4314bb79@linux...  
>>  
>>>That's very cool. I wonder how easy it is to override the FCC imposed  
>>>distance limitations, When we were kids we had a pirate FM station  
>  
> that  
>  
>>>broadcast for almost a mile with a Radio Shack kit.  
>>>  
>>>It really has a different purpose than replacing a burned CD. I always  
>>>thought it would be cool if someone made

---

Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 19:31:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:  
>1. What's a good plugin for noise removal? Anything that will work in Paris?  
>Standalone?  
>  
>2.What are my options for replacing one or both pickups in my Telecaster  
>with humbuckers? I love the way my guitar sounds, and wouldn't want to  
>necessarily change the sound itself, but I sure would love to kill the

>noise...

>

>I play through an old silver-face Fender Twin that a local amp guru has  
>rewired to black-face specs. It sounds amazing, and it's in top shape, but  
>I'd love to get that Tele-Twin combo a little quieter...

>

>Jimmy

>

>Good call Tony.

An Army Corp of Engineer rep said yesterday in an interview that it was years ago when the levee was inadequately designed. The reason - they did a cost/benefit analysis and a more secure levee didn't make sense - I guess the probability of a Cat 5 hurricane was in the negligible range at the time, or they didn't know it would be that bad. Hindsight is always 20/20, especially for those that have nothing to do with planning beforehand...

The levee is mostly porous rock and earth, not concrete and steel. Current federal funding had nothing to do with it - that was maintenance money at best, not redesign. The engineer pretty much said there was nothing that could have been done to the levee short of rebuilding it from scratch that would have stopped what happened.

Please, troll, don't waste our time with politically motivated rantings. Placing blame is a complete waste of time, especially for people who just lost everything in New Orleans, Louisiana and Mississippi. People posting rantings as a way to stick it to the administration are no better than price gouging hotels and gas station owners in Louisiana and Miss - opportunists, at best. The gulf coast is suffering enough, and our country needs to exercise a measure of respect and cohesiveness to resolve the energy crisis we may be facing.

Dedric

in article 43175704@linux, Tony Benson at t o n y @ s t a n d i n g h a m p t o n . c o m wrote on 9/1/05 2:31 PM:

> Ok, everyone together now! TROLL!

>

> Tony

> (yes, my real name and everything) ;>)

>

>

> "Time For a Revolution" <stickittobush@whitehouse.crap> wrote in message  
> news:43174564\$1 @linux...

>>

>> Bush on Good Moring America today....

>>



>> "Who would have thought the levee would have breached?"  
>>  
>>  
>> "No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming"  
>> By Sidney Blumenthal  
>> Salon.com  
>>  
>> Wednesday 31 August 2005  
>>  
>> In 2001, FEMA warned that a hurricane striking New Orleans was one of the  
>> three most likely disasters in the U.S. But the Bush administration cut  
>> New  
>> Orleans flood control funding by 44 percent to pay for the Iraq war.  
>>  
>>  
>> A New Orleans resident waded through floodwaters coated with a fine layer  
>> of oil in the flooded downtown area on Tuesday, August 30, 2005.  
>>  
>> Biblical in its uncontrolled rage and scope, Hurricane Katrina has left  
>> millions of Americans to scavenge for food and shelter and hundreds to  
>> thousands  
>> reportedly dead. With its main levee broken, the evacuated city of New  
>> Orleans  
>> has become part of the Gulf of Mexico. But the damage wrought by the  
>> hurricane  
>> may not entirely be the result of an act of nature.  
>>  
>> 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  
>> essentially  
>> dried up as it was drained into the Iraq war. In 2004, the Bush  
>> administration  
>> cut funding requested by the New Orleans district of the U.S. Army Corps  
>> of Engineers for holding back the waters of Lake Pontchartrain by more  
>> than  
>> 80 percent. Additional cuts at the beginning of this year (for a total

>> reduction  
>> in funding of 44.2 percent since 2001) forced the New Orleans district of  
>> the Corps to impose a hiring freeze. The Senate had debated adding funds  
>> for fixing New Orleans' levees, but it was too late.  
>>  
>> The New Orleans Times-Picayune, which before the hurricane published  
>> a series on the federal funding problem, and whose presses are now  
>> underwater,  
>> reported online: "No one can say they didn't see it coming ... Now in the  
>> wake of one of the worst storms ever, serious questions are being asked  
>> about  
>> the lack of preparation."  
>>  
>> The Bush administration's policy of turning over wetlands to developers  
>> almost certainly also contributed to the heightened level of the storm  
>> surge.  
>> In 1990, a federal task force began restoring lost wetlands surrounding  
>> New  
>> Orleans. Every two miles of wetland between the Crescent City and the Gulf  
>> reduces a surge by half a foot. Bush had promised "no net loss" of  
>> wetlands,  
>> a policy launched by his father's administration and bolstered by  
>> President  
>> Clinton. But he reversed his approach in 2003, unleashing the developers.  
>> The Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency then  
>> announced they could no longer protect wetlands unless they were somehow  
>> related to interstate commerce.  
>>  
>> In response to this potential crisis, four leading environmental groups  
>> conducted a joint expert study, concluding in 2004 that without wetlands  
>> protection New Orleans could be devastated by an ordinary, much less a  
>> Category  
>> 4 or 5, hurricane. "There's no way to describe how mindless a policy that  
>> is when it comes to wetlands protection," said one of the report's  
>> authors.  
>> The chairman of the White House's Council on Environmental Quality  
>> dismissed  
>> the study as "highly questionable," and boasted, "Everybody loves what  
>> we're  
>> doing."  
>>  
>> "My administration's climate change policy will be science based,"  
>> President  
>> Bush declared in June 2001. But in 2002, when the Environmental Protection  
>> Agency submitted a study on global warming to the United Nations  
>> reflecting  
>> its expert research, Bush derided it as "a report put out by a  
>> bureaucracy,"

>> and excised the climate change assessment from the agency's annual report.  
>> The next year, when the EPA issued its first comprehensive "Report on the  
>> Environment," stating, "Climate change has global consequences for human  
>> health and the environment," the White House simply demanded removal of  
>> the  
>> line and all similar conclusions. At the G-8 meeting in Scotland this  
>> year,  
>> Bush successfully stymied any common action on global warming. Scientists,  
>> meanwhile, have continued to accumulate impressive data on the rising  
>> temperature  
>> of the oceans, which has produced more severe hurricanes.  
>>  
>> In February 2004, 60 of the nation's leading scientists, including 20  
>> Nobel laureates, warned in a statement, "Restoring Scientific Integrity in  
>> Policymaking": "Successful appli

---

---

Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 19:38:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

s job. When the Army Corps of Engineers' chief contracting  
>> oversight analyst objected to a \$7 billion no-bid contract awarded for  
>> work  
>> in Iraq to Halliburton (the firm at which Vice President Cheney was  
>> formerly  
>> CEO), she was demoted despite her superior professional ratings. At the  
>> National  
>> Park Service, a former Cheney aide, a political appointee lacking  
>> professional  
>> background, drew up a plan to overturn past environmental practices and  
>> prohibit  
>> any mention of evolution while allowing sale of religious materials  
>> through  
>> the Park Service.  
>>  
>> On the day the levees burst in New Orleans, Bush delivered a speech in  
>> Colorado comparing the Iraq war to World War II and himself to Franklin D.  
>> Roosevelt: "And he knew that the best way to bring peace and stability to  
>> the region was by bringing freedom to Japan." Bush had boarded his very  
>> own  
>> "Streetcar Named Desire."  
>>  
>>  
>  
>not really guys... shooting the messenger isn't a legit debate point,  
although you did provide some additional info.

"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message  
news:BF3CC2D2.4CB%dedric@echomg.com...

> Good call Tony.

>

> An Army Corp of Engineer rep said yesterday in an interview that it was  
> years ago when the levee was inadequately designed. The reason - they did

> a

> cost/benefit analysis and a more secure levee didn't make sense - I guess

> the probability of a Cat 5 hurricane was in the negligible range at the

> time, or they didn't know it would be that bad. Hindsight is always

> 20/20,

> especially for those that have nothing to do with planning beforehand...

>

> The levee is mostly porous rock and earth, not concrete and steel.

> Current

> federal funding had nothing to do with it - that was maintenance money at

> best, not redesign. The engineer pretty much said there was nothing that

> could have been done to the levee short of rebuilding it from scratch that

> would have stopped what happened.

>

> Please, troll, don't waste our time with politically motivated rantings.

> Placing blame is a complete waste of time, especially for people who just

> lost everything in New Orleans, Louisiana and Mississippi. People posting

> rantings as a way to stick it to the administration are no better than

> price

> gouging hotels and gas station owners in Louisiana and Miss -

> opportunists,

> at best. The gulf coast is suffering enough, and our country needs to

> exercise a measure of respect and cohesiveness to resolve the energy

> crisis

> we may be facing.

>

> Dedric

>

> in article 43175704@linux, Tony Benson at t o n y @ s t a n d i n g h a m p

> t

> o n . c o m wrote on 9/1/05 2:31 PM:

>

>> Ok, everyone together now! TROLL!

>>

>> Tony

>> (yes, my real name and everything) ;>)

>>

>>

>> "Time For a Revolution" <stickittobush@whitehouse.crap> wrote in message

>> news:43174564\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> Bush on Good Moring America today....

>>>  
>>> "Who would have thought the levee would have breached?"  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> "No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming"  
>>> By Sidney Blumenthal  
>>> Salon.com  
>>>  
>>> Wednesday 31 August 2005  
>>>  
>>> In 2001, FEMA warned that a hurricane striking New Orleans was one of  
>>> the  
>>> three most likely disasters in the U.S. But the Bush administration cut  
>>> New  
>>> Orleans flood control funding by 44 percent to pay for the Iraq war.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> A New Orleans resident waded through floodwaters coated with a fine  
>>> layer  
>>> of oil in the flooded downtown area on Tuesday, August 30, 2005.  
>>>  
>>> Biblical in its uncontrolled rage and scope, Hurricane Katrina has left  
>>> millions of Americans to scavenge for food and shelter and hundreds to  
>>> thousands  
>>> reportedly dead. With its main levee broken, the evacuated city of New  
>>> Orleans  
>>> has become part of the Gulf of Mexico. But the damage wrought by the  
>>> hurricane  
>>> may not entirely be the result of an act of nature.  
>>>  
>>> 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  
>>> essentially  
>>> dried up as it was drained into the Iraq war. In 2004, the Bush

>>> administration  
>>> cut funding requested by the New Orleans district of the U.S. Army Corps  
>>> of Engineers for holding back the waters of Lake Pontchartrain by more  
>>> than  
>>> 80 percent. Additional cuts at the beginning of this year (for a total  
>>> reduction  
>>> in funding of 44.2 percent since 2001) forced the New Orleans district  
>>> of  
>>> the Corps to impose a hiring freeze. The Senate had debated adding funds  
>>> for fixing New Orleans' levees, but it was too late.  
>>>  
>>> The New Orleans Times-Picayune, which before the hurricane published  
>>> a series on the federal funding problem, and whose presses are now  
>>> underwater,  
>>> reported online: "No one can say they didn't see it coming ... Now in  
>>> the  
>>> wake of one of the worst storms ever, serious questions are being asked  
>>> about  
>>> the lack of preparation."  
>>>  
>>> The Bush administration's policy of turning over wetlands to developers  
>>> almost certainly also contributed to the heightened level of the storm  
>>> surge.  
>>> In 1990, a federal task force began restoring lost wetlands surrounding  
>>> New  
>>> Orleans. Every two miles of wetland between the Crescent City and the  
>>> Gulf  
>>> reduces a surge by half a foot. Bush had promised "no net loss" of  
>>> wetlands,  
>>> a policy launched by his father's administration and bolstered by  
>>> President  
>>> Clinton. But he reversed his approach in 2003, unleashing the  
>>> developers.  
>>> The Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency then  
>>> announced they could no longer protect wetlands unless they were somehow  
>>> related to interstate commerce.  
>>>  
>>> In response to this potential crisis, four leading environmental groups  
>>> conducted a joint expert study, concluding in 2004 that without wetlands  
>>> protection New Orleans could be devastated by an ordinary, much less a  
>>> Category  
>>> 4 or 5, hurricane. "There's no way to describe how mindless a policy  
>>> that  
>>> is when it comes to wetlands protection," said one of the report's  
>>> authors.  
>>> The chairman of the White House's Council on Environmental Quality  
>>> dismissed  
>>> the study as "highly questionable," and boasted, "Everybody loves what

>>> we're  
>>> doing."  
>>>  
>>> "My administration's climate change policy will be science based,"  
>>> President  
>>> Bush declared in June 2001. But in 2002, when the Environmental  
>>> Protection  
>>> Agency submitted a study on global warming to the United Nations  
>>> reflecting  
>>> its expert research, Bush derided it as "a report put out by a  
>>> bureaucracy,"  
>>> and excised the climate change assessment from the agency's annual  
>>> report.  
>>> The next year, when the EPA issued its first comprehensive "Report on  
>>> the  
>>> Environment," stating, "Climate change has global consequences for human  
>>> health and the environment," the White House simply demanded removal of  
>>> the  
>>> line and all similar conclusions. At the G-8 meeting in Scotland this  
>>> year,  
>>> Bush successfully stymied any common action on global warming.  
>>> Scientists,  
>>> meanwhile, have continued to accumulate impressive data on the rising  
>>> temperature  
>>> of the oceans, which has produced more severe hurricanes.  
>>>  
>>> In February 2004, 60 of the nation's leading scientists, including 20  
>>> Nobel laureates, warned in a statement, "Restoring Scientific Integrity  
>>> in  
>>> Policymaking": "Successful application of science has played a large  
>>> part  
>>> in the policies that have made the United States of America the world's  
>>> most  
>>> powerful nation and its citizens increasingly prosperous and healthy ...  
>>> Indeed, this principle has long been adhered to by presidents and  
>>> administrations  
>>> of both parties in forming and implementing policies. The administration  
>>> of George W. Bus

---

---

Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming  
Posted by [justcron](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 20:51:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

h has, however, disregarded this principle ... The  
>>> distortion  
>>> of scientific knowledge for partisan political ends must cease." Bush  
>>> completely

>>> ignored this statement.  
>>>  
>>> In the two weeks preceding the storm in the Gulf, the trumping of  
>>> science  
>>> by ideology and expertise by special interests accelerated. The Federal  
>>> Drug  
>>> Administration announced that it was postponing sale of the  
>>> morning-after  
>>> contraceptive pill, despite overwhelming scientific evidence of its  
>>> safety  
>>> and its approval by the FDA's scientific advisory board. The United  
>>> Nations  
>>> special envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa accused the Bush administration of  
>>> responsibility  
>>> for a condom shortage in Uganda -- the result of the administration's  
>>> evangelical  
>>> Christian agenda of "abstinence." When the chief of the Bureau of  
>>> Justice  
>>> Statistics in the Justice Department was ordered by the White House to  
>>> delete  
>>> its study that African-Americans and other minorities are subject to  
>>> racial  
>>> profiling in police traffic stops and he refused to buckle under, he was  
>>> forced out of his job. When the Army Corps of Engineers' chief  
>>> contracting  
>>> oversight analyst objected to a \$7 billion no-bid contract awarded for  
>>> work  
>>> in Iraq to Halliburton (the firm at which Vice President Cheney was  
>>> formerly  
>>> CEO), she was demoted despite her superior professional ratings. At the  
>>> National  
>>> Park Service, a former Cheney aide, a political appointee lacking  
>>> professional  
>>> background, drew up a plan to overturn past environmental practices and  
>>> prohibit  
>>> any mention of evolution while allowing sale of religious materials  
>>> through  
>>> the Park Service.  
>>>  
>>> On the day the levees burst in New Orleans, Bush delivered a speech in  
>>> Colorado comparing the Iraq war to World War II and himself to Franklin  
>>> D.  
>>> Roosevelt: "And he knew that the best way to bring peace and stability  
>>> to  
>>> the region was by bringing freedom to Japan." Bush had boarded his very  
>>> own  
>>> "Streetcar Named Desire."  
>>>



>>>  
>>  
>>  
>Thanks Dimitrios!

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:

>Dear Dale,  
>We were talking about comprssion in aux some posts before...  
>If you wanna use compression on a vocal track just put it as insert on eds  
>slots so you will have only wet compressed vocal output.  
>If you wanna mix uncompressed and compressed (mostly used for drums+bass)  
>please read my previous post.  
>"Compressed drumtracks along with uncompressed"  
>I hope this helps a bit...  
>Regards,  
>Dimitrios

>  
>"Dale" <dalebradleycello@yahoo.com> wrote in message  
>news:4316a20f\$1@linux...

>>  
>> My problem (well, one of the lesser ones anyway):  
>>  
>> I used mild EDS compresion (in the Aux) to tame the loud

>> toilet paper tube (a rather large one). Is this possibly an issue  
>> due to mixing both compressed / uncompressed signals? If so, is  
>> it somehow normal procedure to insert the compression into the

>> more sense rather than blending wet/dry signal in the aux.  
>>  
>> I recorded live tracks (piano, voice, cello, flute) together

>>

>> grade level directions would be much appreciated.

>>  
>> TIA,  
>>  
>> Dale

>  
>Or stand inside a well grounded faraday Cage to put your parts down.  
On-stage it would look very "Spinal Tap" ;-)

David.

Brandon wrote:

> Turn off your computer monitor if you have the old bulky type.  
>  
> Shield your electronics compartment on your tele with that paper shielding  
> (adhesive on one side).  
>  
> Use a gate. or just cut out the noise manually.  
>  
> Cool edit pro has a pretty good noise filter , but you have to process it.  
> make sure you get a sample of just the noise for Cep sample.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> "uptown jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:  
>  
>>1. What's a good plugin for noise removal? Anything that will work in Paris?  
>>Standalone?  
>>  
>>2.What are my options for replacing one or both pickups in my Telecaster  
>>with humbuckers? I love the way my guitar sounds, and wouldn't want to  
>>necessarily change the sound itself, but I sure would love to kill the  
>>noise...  
>>  
>>I play through an old silver-face Fender Twin that a local amp guru has  
>>rewired to black-face specs. It sounds amazing, and it's in top shape, but  
>>I'd love to get that Tele-Twin combo a little quieter...  
>>  
>>Jimmy  
>>  
>>  
>  
>and when you do use CEP/Audition DO NOT use more than 50% reduction  
per pass. do more passes at lower reduction levels.

On 2 Sep 2005 06:39:46 +1000, "Brandon" <s@s.com> wrote:

>  
>Turn off your computer monitor if you have the old bulky type.  
>  
>Shield your electronics compartment on your tele with that paper shielding  
>(adhesive on one side).  
>  
>Use a gate. or just cut out the noise manually.  
>  
>Cool edit pro has a pretty good noise filter , but you have to process it.

>make sure you get a sample of just the noise for Cep sample.

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

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

>>1. What's a good plugin for noise removal? Anything that will work in Paris?

>>Standalone?

>>

>>2.What are my options for replacing one or both pickups in my Telecaster

>>with humbuckers? I love the way my guitar sounds, and wouldn't want to

>>necessarily change the sound itself, but I sure would love to kill the

>>noise...

>>

>>I play through an old silver-face Fender Twin that a local amp guru has

>>rewired to black-face specs. It sounds amazing, and it's in top shape, but

>>I'd love to get that Tele-Twin combo a little quieter...

>>

>>Jimmy

>>

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

>2.What are my options for replacing one or both pickups in my Telecaster

>with humbuckers? I love the way my guitar sounds, and wouldn't want to

>necessarily change the sound itself, but I sure would love to kill the

>noise...

These pickups \*kill\* and are dead silent. Not fake single coil sound, but the best, clear single coil sound I've ever heard, despite being dead silent.

<http://www.fralinpickups.com/humbuckers.asp#p92>

I use the "Twangmaster" and love it. It's 2 coils, but each coil is only covering 3 strings. That way the coils can be in series, so you get the silence of a HB, but because only 1 coil picks up each string, you get the sound of a single.

Another option, if you want something to go in the standard cutout is Chris Kinman's stuff.

<http://www.kinman.com>

His Tele pickups are very quiet and sound terrific, and don't require cutting any larger openings 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.

DCThat only applies if the messenger is delivering the truth.

I have proof that all the money diverted from any federal flood control projects was used to pay for welfare programs, grants for people who roll around in shit and call it art, federally funded abortion clinics, and interest on defaulted student loans.

;>)

Obviously, the above sentence is farce, as is the linked article in question.

Tony

"justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message news:431769bb@linux...

> not really guys... shooting the messenger isn't a legit debate point,  
> although you did provide some additional info.

>

> "Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message  
> news:BF3CC2D2.4CB%dedric@echomg.com...

>> Good call Tony.

>>

>> An Army Corp of Engineer rep said yesterday in an interview that it was  
>> years ago when the levee was inadequately designed. The reason - they  
>> did a

>> cost/benefit analysis and a more secure levee didn't make sense - I guess  
>> the probability of a Cat 5 hurricane was in the negligible range at the  
>> time, or they didn't know it would be that bad. Hindsight is always  
>> 20/20,

>> especially for those that have nothing to do with planning beforehand...

>>

>> The levee is mostly porous rock and earth, not concrete and steel.

>> Current

>> federal funding had nothing to do with it - that was maintenance money at  
>> best, not redesign. The engineer pretty much said there was nothing that  
>> could have been done to the levee short of rebuilding it from scratch

>> that

>> would have stopped what happened.

>>  
>> Please, troll, don't waste our time with politically motivated rantings.  
>> Placing blame is a complete waste of time, especially for people who just  
>> lost everything in New Orleans, Louisiana and Mississippi. People  
>> posting  
>> rantings as a way to stick it to the administration are no better than  
>> price  
>> gouging hotels and gas station owners in Louisiana and Miss -  
>> opportunists,  
>> at best. The gulf coast is suffering enough, and our country needs to  
>> exercise a measure of respect and cohesiveness to resolve the energy  
>> crisis  
>> we may be facing.  
>>  
>> Dedic  
>>  
>> in article 43175704@linux, Tony Benson at t o n y@s t a n d i n g h a m p  
>> t  
>> o n .c o m wrote on 9/1/05 2:31 PM:  
>>  
>>> Ok, everyone together now! TROLL!  
>>>  
>>> Tony  
>>> (yes, my real name and everything) ;>  
>>>  
>>>

---

---

Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming  
Posted by [Dedic Terry](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 20:52:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

conclusions. At the G-8 meeting in Scotland this  
>>>> year,  
>>>> Bush successfully stymied any common action on global warming.  
>>>> Scientists,  
>>>> meanwhile, have continued to accumulate impressive data on the rising  
>>>> temperature  
>>>> of the oceans, which has produced more severe hurricanes.  
>>>>  
>>>> In February 2004, 60 of the nation's leading scientists, including 20  
>>>> Nobel laureates, warned in a statement, "Restoring Scientific Integrity  
>>>> in  
>>>> Policymaking": "Successful application of science has played a large  
>>>> part  
>>>> in the policies that have made the United States of America the world's  
>>>> most  
>>>> powerful nation and its citizens increasingly prosperous and healthy ...

>>>> Indeed, this principle has long been adhered to by presidents and  
>>>> administrations  
>>>> of both parties in forming and implementing policies. The administration  
>>>> of George W. Bush has, however, disregarded this principle ... The  
>>>> distortion  
>>>> of scientific knowledge for partisan political ends must cease." Bush  
>>>> completely  
>>>> ignored this statement.  
>>>>  
>>>> In the two weeks preceding the storm in the Gulf, the trumping of  
>>>> science  
>>>> by ideology and expertise by special interests accelerated. The Federal  
>>>> Drug  
>>>> Administration announced that it was postponing sale of the  
>>>> morning-after  
>>>> contraceptive pill, despite overwhelming scientific evidence of its  
>>>> safety  
>>>> and its approval by the FDA's scientific advisory board. The United  
>>>> Nations  
>>>> special envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa accused the Bush administration of  
>>>> responsibility  
>>>> for a condom shortage in Uganda -- the result of the administration's  
>>>> evangelical  
>>>> Christian agenda of "abstinence." When the chief of the Bureau of  
>>>> Justice  
>>>> Statistics in the Justice Department was ordered by the White House to  
>>>> delete  
>>>> its study that African-Americans and other minorities are subject to  
>>>> racial  
>>>> profiling in police traffic stops and he refused to buckle under, he was  
>>>> forced out of his job. When the Army Corps of Engineers' chief  
>>>> contracting  
>>>> oversight analyst objected to a \$7 billion no-bid contract awarded for  
>>>> work  
>>>> in Iraq to Halliburton (the firm at which Vice President Cheney was  
>>>> formerly  
>>>> CEO), she was demoted despite her superior professional ratings. At the  
>>>> National  
>>>> Park Service, a former Cheney aide, a political appointee lacking  
>>>> professional  
>>>> background, drew up a plan to overturn past environmental practices and  
>>>> prohibit  
>>>> any mention of evolution while allowing sale of religious materials  
>>>> through  
>>>> the Park Service.  
>>>>  
>>>> On the day the levees burst in New Orleans, Bush delivered a speech in  
>>>> Colorado comparing the Iraq war to World War II and himself to Franklin

>>>> D.  
>>>> Roosevelt: "And he knew that the best way to bring peace and stability  
>>>> to  
>>>> the region was by bringing freedom to Japan." Bush had boarded his very  
>>>> own  
>>>> "Streetcar Named Desire."  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>  
>"Tony Benson" <t o n y@s t a n d i n g h a m p t o n.c o m> wrote:  
>That only applies if the messenger is delivering the truth.  
>  
>I have proof that all the money diverted from any federal flood control

>projects was used to pay for welfare programs, grants for people who roll  
>around in shit and call it art, federally funded abortion clinics, and  
>interest on defaulted student loans.  
>  
>what a warm and fuzzy response  
>JMyou guys are funny...

what do YOU consider a reliable source?

FWIW, I've been hearing the same thing reported all day on multiple channels.

"Tony Benson" <t o n y@s t a n d i n g h a m p t o n.c o m> wrote in message news:4317792a@linux...

> That only applies if the messenger is delivering the truth.  
>  
> I have proof that all the money diverted from any federal flood control  
> projects was used to pay for welfare programs, grants for people who roll  
> around in shit and call it art, federally funded abortion clinics, and  
> interest on defaulted student loans.  
>  
> ;>  
>  
> Obviously, the above sentence is farce, as is the linked article in  
> question.  
>  
> Tony  
>  
>  
> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message

> news:431769bb@linux...  
>> not really guys... shooting the messenger isn't a legit debate point,  
>> although you did provide some additional info.  
>>  
>> "Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message  
>> news:BF3CC2D2.4CB%dedric@echomg.com...  
>>> Good call Tony.  
>>>  
>>> An Army Corp of Engineer rep said yesterday in an interview that it was  
>>> years ago when the levee was inadequately designed. The reason - they  
>>> did a  
>>> cost/benefit analysis and a more secure levee didn't make sense - I  
>>> guess  
>>> the probability of a Cat 5 hurricane was in the negligible range at the  
>>> time, or they didn't know it would be that bad. Hindsight is always  
>>> 20/20,  
>>> especially for those that have nothing to do with planning beforehand...  
>>>  
>>> The levee is mostly porous rock and earth, not concrete and steel.  
>>> Current  
>>> federal funding had nothing to do with it - that was maintenance money  
>>> at  
>>> best, not redesign. The engineer pretty much said there was nothing that  
>>> could have been done to the levee short of rebuilding it from scratch  
>>> that  
>>> would have stopped what happened.  
>>>  
>>> Please, troll, don't waste our time with politically motivated rantings.  
>>> Placing blame is a complete waste of time, especially for people who  
>>> just  
>>> lost everything in New Orleans, Louisiana and Mississippi. People  
>>> posting  
>>> rantings as a way to stick it to the administration are no better than  
>>> price  
>>> gouging hotels and gas station owners in Louisiana and Miss -  
>>> opportunists,  
>>> at best. The gulf coast is suffering enough, and our country needs to  
>>> exercise a measure of respect and cohesiveness to resolve the energy  
>>> crisis  
>>> we may be facing.  
>>>  
>>> Dedric  
>>>  
>>> in article 43175704@linux, Tony Benson at t o n y @ s t a n d i n g h a m  
>>> p t  
>>> o n . c o m wrote on 9/1/05 2:31 PM:  
>>>  
>>>> Ok, everyone together now! TROLL!



>>>>  
>>>> Tony  
>>>> (yes, my real name and everything) ;>)  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "Time For a Revolution" <stickittobush@whitehouse.crap> wrote in  
>>>> message  
>>>> news:43174564\$1@linux...  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Bush on Good Moring America today....  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "Who would have thought the levee would have breached?"  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming"  
>>>>> By Sidney Blumenthal  
>>>>> Salon.com  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Wednesday 31 August 2005  
>>>>>  
>>>>> In 2001, FEMA warned that a hurricane striking New Orleans was one of  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> three most likely disasters in the U.S. But the Bush administration  
>>>>> cut  
>>>>> New  
>>>>> Orleans flood control funding by 44 percent to pay for the Iraq war.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> A New Orleans resident waded through floodwaters coated with a fine  
>>>>> layer  
>>>>> of oil in the flooded downtown area on Tuesday, August 30, 2005.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Biblical in its uncontrolled rage and scope, Hurricane Katrina has  
>>>>> left  
>>>>> millions of Americans to scavenge for food and shelter and hundreds to  
>>>>> thousands  
>>>>> reportedly dead. With its main levee broken, the evacuated city of New  
>>>>> Orleans  
>>>>> has become part of the Gulf of Mexico. But the damage wrought by the  
>>>>> hurricane  
>>>>> may not entirely be the result of an act of nature.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> 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  
>>>> essentially  
>>>> dried up as it was drained into the Iraq war. In 2004, the Bush  
>>>> administration  
>>>> cut funding requested by the New Orleans district of the U.S. Army  
>>>> Corps  
>>>> of Engineers for holding back the waters of Lake Pontchartrain by more  
>>>> than  
>>>> 80 percent. Additional cuts at the beginning of this year (for a total  
>>>> reduction  
>>>> in funding of 44.2 percent since 2001) forced the New Orleans district  
>>>> of  
>>>> the Corps to impose a hiring freeze. The Senate had debated adding  
>>>> funds  
>>>> for fixing New Orleans' levees, but it was too late.  
>>>>  
>>>> The New Orleans Times-Picayune, which before the hurricane published  
>>>> a series on the federal funding problem, and whose presses are now  
>>>> underwater,  
>>>> reported online: "No one can say they didn't see it coming ... Now in  
>>>> the  
>>>> wake of one of the worst storms ever, serious questions are being  
>>>> asked  
>>>> about  
>>>> the lack of preparation."  
>>>>  
>>>> The Bush administration's policy of turning over wetlands to  
>>>> developers  
>>>> almost certainly also contributed to the heightened level of the storm  
>>>> surge.  
>>>> In 1990, a federal task force began restoring lost wetlands  
>>>> surrounding  
>>>> New  
>>>> Orleans. Every two miles of wetland between the Crescent City and the  
>>>> Gulf  
>>>> reduces a surge by half a foot. Bush had promised "no net loss" of  
>>>> wetlands,  
>>>> a policy launched by his father's administration and bolstered by  
>>>> President

>>>> Clinton. But he reversed his approach in 2003, unleashing the  
>>>> developers.  
>>>> The

---

---

Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 21:56:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

t;> The next year, when the EPA issued its first comprehensive "Report on  
>>>> the  
>>>> Environment," stating, "Climate change has global consequences for  
>>>> human  
>>>> health and the environment," the White House simply demanded removal of  
>>>> the  
>>>> line and all similar conclusions. At the G-8 meeting in Scotland this  
>>>> year,  
>>>> Bush successfully stymied any common action on global warming.  
>>>> Scientists,  
>>>> meanwhile, have continued to accumulate impressive data on the rising  
>>>> temperature  
>>>> of the oceans, which has produced more severe hurricanes.  
>>>>  
>>>> In February 2004, 60 of the nation's leading scientists, including 20  
>>>> Nobel laureates, warned in a statement, "Restoring Scientific Integrity  
>>>> in  
>>>> Policymaking": "Successful application of science has played a large  
>>>> part  
>>>> in the policies that have made the United States of America the world's  
>>>> most  
>>>> powerful nation and its citizens increasingly prosperous and healthy  
>>>> ...  
>>>> Indeed, this principle has long been adhered to by presidents and  
>>>> administrations  
>>>> of both parties in forming and implementing policies. The  
>>>> administration  
>>>> of George W. Bush has, however, disregarded this principle ... The  
>>>> distortion  
>>>> of scientific knowledge for partisan political ends must cease." Bush  
>>>> completely  
>>>> ignored this statement.  
>>>>  
>>>> In the two weeks preceding the storm in the Gulf, the trumping of  
>>>> science  
>>>> by ideology and expertise by special interests accelerated. The Federal  
>>>> Drug  
>>>> Administration announced that it was postponing sale of the  
>>>> morning-after

>>>> contraceptive pill, despite overwhelming scientific evidence of its  
>>>> safety  
>>>> and its approval by the FDA's scientific advisory board. The United  
>>>> Nations  
>>>> special envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa accused the Bush administration of  
>>>> responsibility  
>>>> for a condom shortage in Uganda -- the result of the administration's  
>>>> evangelical  
>>>> Christian agenda of "abstinence." When the chief of the Bureau of  
>>>> Justice  
>>>> Statistics in the Justice Department was ordered by the White House to  
>>>> delete  
>>>> its study that African-Americans and other minorities are subject to  
>>>> racial  
>>>> profiling in police traffic stops and he refused to buckle under, he  
>>>> was  
>>>> forced out of his job. When the Army Corps of Engineers' chief  
>>>> contracting  
>>>> oversight analyst objected to a \$7 billion no-bid contract awarded for  
>>>> work  
>>>> in Iraq to Halliburton (the firm at which Vice President Cheney was  
>>>> formerly  
>>>> CEO), she was demoted despite her superior professional ratings. At the  
>>>> National  
>>>> Park Service, a former Cheney aide, a political appointee lacking  
>>>> professional  
>>>> background, drew up a plan to overturn past environmental practices and  
>>>> prohibit  
>>>> any mention of evolution while allowing sale of religious materials  
>>>> through  
>>>> the Park Service.  
>>>>  
>>>> On the day the levees burst in New Orleans, Bush delivered a speech in  
>>>> Colorado comparing the Iraq war to World War II and himself to Franklin  
>>>> D.  
>>>> Roosevelt: "And he knew that the best way to bring peace and stability  
>>>> to  
>>>> the region was by bringing freedom to Japan." Bush had boarded his very  
>>>> own  
>>>> "Streetcar Named Desire."  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>  
>Anonymous posting of politically motivated website articles using every  
topic from the Iraq war to AIDs as to argue why the Bush administration was

responsible for not preventing the levee break isn't a well reasoned basis for a legitimate debate.

in article 431769bb@linux, justcron at justcron@hydrerecords.compound wrote on 9/1/05 3:51 PM:

> not really guys... shooting the messenger isn't a legit debate point,  
> although you did provide some additional info.  
>  
> "Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message  
> news:BF3CC2D2.4CB%dedric@echomg.com...  
>> Good call Tony.  
>>  
>> An Army Corp of Engineer rep said yesterday in an interview that it was  
>> years ago when the levee was inadequately designed. The reason - they did  
>> a  
>> cost/benefit analysis and a more secure levee didn't make sense - I guess  
>> the probability of a Cat 5 hurricane was in the negligible range at the  
>> time, or they didn't know it would be that bad. Hindsight is always  
>> 20/20,  
>> especially for those that have nothing to do with planning beforehand...  
>>  
>> The levee is mostly porous rock and earth, not concrete and steel.  
>> Current  
>> federal funding had nothing to do with it - that was maintenance money at  
>> best, not redesign. The engineer pretty much said there was nothing that  
>> could have been done to the levee short of rebuilding it from scratch that  
>> would have stopped what happened.  
>>  
>> Please, troll, don't waste our time with politically motivated rantings.  
>> Placing blame is a complete waste of time, especially for people who just  
>> lost everything in New Orleans, Louisiana and Mississippi. People posting  
>> rantings as a way to stick it to the administration are no better than  
>> price  
>> gouging hotels and gas station owners in Louisiana and Miss -  
>> opportunists,  
>> at best. The gulf coast is suffering enough, and our country needs to  
>> exercise a measure of respect and cohesiveness to resolve the energy  
>> crisis  
>> we may be facing.  
>>  
>> Dedric  
>>  
>> in article 43175704@linux, Tony Benson at t o n y @ s t a n d i n g h a m p  
>> t  
>> o n . c o m wrote on 9/1/05 2:31 PM:  
>>  
>>> Ok, everyone together now! TROLL!

>>>  
>>> Tony  
>>> (yes, my real name and everything) ;>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> "Time For a Revolution" <stickittobush@whitehouse.crap> wrote in message  
>>> news:43174564\$1@linux...  
>>>>  
>>>> Bush on Good Moring America today....  
>>>>  
>>>> "Who would have thought the levee would have breached?"  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming"  
>>>> By Sidney Blumenthal  
>>>> Salon.com  
>>>>  
>>>> Wednesday 31 August 2005  
>>>>  
>>>> In 2001, FEMA warned that a hurricane striking New Orleans was one of  
>>>> the  
>>>> three most likely disasters in the U.S. But the Bush administration cut  
>>>> New  
>>>> Orleans flood control funding by 44 percent to pay for the Iraq war.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> A New Orleans resident waded through floodwaters coated with a fine  
>>>> layer  
>>>> of oil in the flooded downtown area on Tuesday, August 30, 2005.  
>>>>  
>>>> Biblical in its uncontrolled rage and scope, Hurricane Katrina has left  
>>>> millions of Americans to scavenge for food and shelter and hundreds to  
>>>> thousands  
>>>> reportedly dead. With its main levee broken, the evacuated city of New  
>>>> Orleans  
>>>> has become part of the Gulf of Mexico. But the damage wrought by the  
>>>> hurricane  
>>>> may not entirely be the result of an act of nature.  
>>>>  
>>>> 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  
>>>> essentially  
>>>> dried up as it was drained into the Iraq war. In 2004, the Bush  
>>>> administration  
>>>> cut funding requested by the New Orleans district of the U.S. Army Corps  
>>>> of Engineers for holding back the waters of Lake Pontchartrain by more  
>>>> than  
>>>> 80 percent. Additional cuts at the beginning of this year (for a total  
>>>> reduction  
>>>> in funding of 44.2 percent since 2001) forced the New Orleans district  
>>>> of  
>>>> the Corps to impose a hiring freeze. The Senate had debated adding funds  
>>>> for fixing New Orleans' levees, but it was too late.  
>>>>  
>>>> The New Orleans Times-Picayune, which before the hurricane published  
>>>> a series on the federal funding problem, and whose presses are now  
>>>> underwater,  
>>>> reported online: "No one can say they didn't see it coming ... Now in  
>>>> the  
>>>> wake of one of the worst storms ever, serious questions are being asked  
>>>> about  
>>>> the lack of preparation."  
>>>>  
>>>> The Bush administration's policy of turning over wetlands to developers  
>>>> almost certainly also contributed to the heightened level of the storm  
>>>> surge.  
>>>> In 1990, a federal task force began restoring lost wetlands surrounding  
>>>> New  
>>>> Orleans. Every two miles of wetland between the Crescent City and the  
>>>> Gulf  
>>>> reduces a surge by half a foot. Bush had promised "no net loss" of  
>>>> wetlands,  
>>>> a policy launched by his father's administration and bolstered by  
>>>> President  
>>>> Clinton. But he reversed his approach in 2003, unleashing the  
>>>> developers.  
>>>> The Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency then  
>>>> announced they could no longer protect wetlands unless they were somehow  
>>>> related to interstate commerce.  
>>>>  
>>>> In response to this potential crisis, four leading environmental groups  
>>>> conducted a joint expert study, concluding in 2004 that without wetlands

>>>> protection New Orleans could be devastated by an ordinary, much less a  
>>>> Category  
>>>> 4 or 5, hurricane. "There's no way to describe how mindless a policy  
>>>> that  
>>>> is when it comes to wetlands protection," said one of the report's  
>>>> authors.  
>>>> The chairman of the White House's Council on Environmental Quality  
>>>> dismissed  
>>>> the study as "highly questionable," and boasted, "Everybody loves what  
>>>> we're  
>>>> doing."  
>>>>  
>>>> "My administration's climate change policy will be science based,"  
>>>> President  
>>>> Bush declared in June 2001. But in 2002, when the Environmental  
>>>> Protection  
>>>> Agency submitted a study on global warming to the United Nations  
>>>> reflecting  
>>>> its expert research, Bush derided it as "a report put out by a  
>>>> bureaucracy,"  
>>>> and excised the climate change assessment from the agency's annual  
>>>> report.  
>>>> The next year, when the EPA issued its first comprehensive "Report on  
>>>> the  
>>>> Environment," stating, "Climate change has global consequences for human  
>>>> health and the environment," the White House simply demanded removal of  
>>>> the  
>>>> line and all similar

---

---

Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming  
Posted by [Jason Miles](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 22:21:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency  
>>>>> then  
>>>>> announced they could no longer protect wetlands unless they were  
>>>>> somehow  
>>>>> related to interstate commerce.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> In response to this potential crisis, four leading environmental  
>>>>> groups  
>>>>> conducted a joint expert study, concluding in 2004 that without  
>>>>> wetlands  
>&g

---



Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming

Posted by [justcron](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 22:50:40 GMT

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

---

t;>>> protection New Orleans could be devastated by an ordinary, much less a  
>>>> Category  
>>>> 4 or 5, hurricane. "There's no way to describe how mindless a policy  
>>>> that  
>>>> is when it comes to wetlands protection," said one of the report's  
>>>> authors.  
>>>> The chairman of the White House's Council on Environmental Quality  
>>>> dismissed  
>>>> the study as "highly questionable," and boasted, "Everybody loves what  
>>>> we're  
>>>> doing."  
>>>>  
>>>> "My administration's climate change policy will be science based,"  
>>>> President  
>>>> Bush declared in June 2001. But in 2002, when the Environmental  
>>>> Protection  
>>>> Agency submitted a study on global warming to the United Nations  
>>>> reflecting  
>>>> its expert research, Bush derided it as "a report put out by a  
>>>> bureaucracy,"  
>>>> and excised the climate change assessment from the agency's annual  
>>>> report.  
>>>> The next year, when the EPA issued its first comprehensive "Report on  
>>>> the  
>>>> Environment," stating, "Climate change has global consequences for  
>>>> human  
>>>> health and the environment," the White House simply demanded removal  
>>>> of  
>>>> the  
>>>> line and all similar conclusions. At the G-8 meeting in Scotland this  
>>>> year,  
>>>> Bush successfully stymied any common action on global warming.  
>>>> Scientists,  
>>>> meanwhile, have continued to accumulate impressive data on the rising  
>>>> temperature  
>>>> of the oceans, which has produced more severe hurricanes.  
>>>>  
>>>> In February 2004, 60 of the nation's leading scientists, including 20  
>>>> Nobel laureates, warned in a statement, "Restoring Scientific  
>>>> Integrity in  
>>>> Policymaking": "Successful application of science has played a large  
>>>> part  
>>>> in the policies that have made the United States of America the  
>>>> world's  
>>>> most

>>>> powerful nation and its citizens increasingly prosperous and healthy  
>>>> ...  
>>>> Indeed, this principle has long been adhered to by presidents and  
>>>> administrations  
>>>> of both parties in forming and implementing policies. The  
>>>> administration  
>>>> of George W. Bush has, however, disregarded this principle ... The  
>>>> distortion  
>>>> of scientific knowledge for partisan political ends must cease." Bush  
>>>> completely  
>>>> ignored this statement.  
>>>>  
>>>> In the two weeks preceding the storm in the Gulf, the trumping of  
>>>> science  
>>>> by ideology and expertise by special interests accelerated. The  
>>>> Federal  
>>>> Drug  
>>>> Administration announced that it was postponing sale of the  
>>>> morning-after  
>>>> contraceptive pill, despite overwhelming scientific evidence of its  
>>>> safety  
>>>> and its approval by the FDA's scientific advisory board. The United  
>>>> Nations  
>>>> special envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa accused the Bush administration  
>>>> of  
>>>> responsibility  
>>>> for a condom shortage in Uganda -- the result of the administration's  
>>>> evangelical  
>>>> Christian agenda of "abstinence." When the chief of the Bureau of  
>>>> Justice  
>>>> Statistics in the Justice Department was ordered by the White House to  
>>>> delete  
>>>> its study that African-Americans and other minorities are subject to  
>>>> racial  
>>>> profiling in police traffic stops and he refused to buckle under, he  
>>>> was  
>>>> forced out of his job. When the Army Corps of Engineers' chief  
>>>> contracting  
>>>> oversight analyst objected to a \$7 billion no-bid contract awarded for  
>>>> work  
>>>> in Iraq to Halliburton (the firm at which Vice President Cheney was  
>>>> formerly  
>>>> CEO), she was demoted despite her superior professional ratings. At  
>>>> the  
>>>> National  
>>>> Park Service, a former Cheney aide, a political appointee lacking  
>>>> professional  
>>>> background, drew up a plan to overturn past environmental practices



Dedric Terry <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:

>Anonymous posting of politically motivated website articles using every  
>topic from the Iraq war to AIDs as to argue why the Bush administration  
was

>responsible for not preventing the levee break isn't a well reasoned basis  
>for a legitimate debate.

>

>in article 431769bb@linux, justcron at justcron@hydrorecords.compound wrote  
>on 9/1/05 3:51 PM:

>

>> not really guys... shooting the messenger isn't a legit debate point,

>> although you did provide some additional info.

>>

>> "Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote in message

>> news:BF3CC2D2.4CB%dedric@echomg.com...

>>> Good call Tony.

>>>

>>> An Army Corp of Engineer rep said yesterday in an interview that it was  
>>> years ago when the levee was inadequately designed. The reason - they  
did

>>> a

>>> cost/benefit analysis and a more secure levee didn't make sense - I guess

>>> the probability of a Cat 5 hurricane was in the negligible range at the

>>> time, or they didn't know it would be that bad. Hindsight is always

>>> 20/20,

>>> especially for those that have nothing to do with planning beforehand...

>>>

>>> The levee is mostly porous rock and earth, not concrete and steel.

>>> Current

>>> federal funding had nothing to do with it - that was maintenance money  
at

>>> best, not redesign. The engineer pretty much said there was nothing that

>>> could have been done to the levee short of rebuilding it from scratch

that

>>> would have stopped what happened.

>>>

>>> Please, troll, don't waste our time with politically motivated rantings.

>>> Placing blame is a complete waste of time, especially for people who  
just

>>> lost everything in New Orleans, Louisiana and Mississippi. People posting

>>> rantings as a way to stick it to the administration are no better than

>>> price

>>> gouging hotels and gas station owners in Louisiana and Miss -

>>> opportunists,

>>> at best. The gulf coast is suffering enough, and our country needs to

>>> exercise a measure of respect and cohesiveness to resolve the energy  
>>> crisis  
>>> we may be facing.  
>>>  
>>> Dedic  
>>>  
>>> in article 43175704@linux, Tony Benson at t o n y @ s t a n d i n g h a  
m p  
>>> t  
>>> o n . c o m wrote on 9/1/05 2:31 PM:  
>>>  
>>>> Ok, everyone together now! TROLL!  
>>>>  
>>>> Tony  
>>>> (yes, my real name and everything) ;>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "Time For a Revolution" <stickittobush@whitehouse.crap> wrote in message  
>>>> news:43174564\$1@linux...  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Bush on Good Moring America today....  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "Who would have thought the levee would have breached?"  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming"  
>>>>> By Sidney Blumenthal  
>>>>> Salon.com  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Wednesday 31 August 2005  
>>>>>  
>>>>> In 2001, FEMA warned that a hurricane striking New Orleans was one  
of  
>>>>> the  
>>>>> three most likely disasters in the U.S. But the Bush administration  
cut  
>>>>> New  
>>>>> Orleans flood control funding by 44 percent to pay for the Iraq war.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> A New Orleans resident waded through floodwaters coated with a fine  
>>>>> layer  
>>>>> of oil in the flooded downtown area on Tuesday, August 30, 2005.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Biblical in its uncontrolled rage and scope, Hurricane Katrina has  
left  
>>>>> millions of Americans to scavenge for food and shelter and hundreds  
to

>>>> thousands  
>>>> reportedly dead. With its main levee broken, the evacuated city of  
New  
>>>> Orleans  
>>>> has become part of the Gulf of Mexico. But the damage wrought by the  
>>>> hurricane  
>>>> may not entirely be the result of an act of nature.  
>>>>  
>>>> 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  
>>>> essentially  
>>>> dried up as it was drained into the Iraq war. In 2004, the Bush  
>>>> administration  
>>>> cut funding requested by the New Orleans district of the U.S. Army  
Corps  
>>>> of Engineers for holding back the waters of Lake Pontchartrain by more  
>>>> than  
>>>> 80 percent. Additional cuts at the beginning of this year (for a total  
>>>> reduction  
>>>> in funding of 44.2 percent since 2001) forced the New Orleans district  
>>>> of  
>>>> the Corps to impose a hiring freeze. The Senate had debated adding  
funds  
>>>> for fixing New Orleans' levees, but it was too late.  
>>>>  
>>>> The New Orleans Times-Picayune, which before the hurricane published  
>>>> a series on the federal funding problem, and whose presses are now  
>>>> underwater,  
>>>> reported online: "No one can say they didn't see it coming ... Now  
in  
>>>> the  
>>>> wake of one of the worst storms ever, serious questions are being asked  
>>>> about

>>>> the lack of preparation."  
>>>>  
>>>> The Bush administration's policy of turning over wetlands to developers  
>>>> almost certainly also contributed to the heightened level of the storm  
>>>> surge.  
>>>> In 1990, a federal task force began restoring lost wetlands surrounding  
>>>> New  
>>>> Orleans. Every two miles of wetland between the Crescent City and the  
>>>> Gulf  
>>>> reduces a surge by half a foot. Bush had promised "no net loss" of  
>>>> wetlands,  
>>>> a policy launched by his father's administration and bolstered by  
>>>> President  
>>>> Clinton. But he reversed his approach in 2003, unleashing the  
>>>> developers.  
>>>> The Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency

---

---

Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming  
Posted by [Brandon oops i mean a](#) on Thu, 01 Sep 2005 23:11:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

t;> we're  
>>>> doing."  
>>>>  
>>>> "My administration's climate change policy will be science based,"  
>>>> President  
>>>> Bush declared in June 2001. But in 2002, when the Environmental  
>>>> Protection  
>>>> Agency submitted a study on global warming to the United Nations  
>>>> reflecting  
>>>> its expert research, Bush derided it as "a report put out by a  
>>>> bureaucracy,"  
>>>> and excised the climate change assessment from the agency's annual  
>>>> report.  
>>>> The next year, when the EPA issued its first comprehensive "Report  
on  
>>>> the  
>>>> Environment," stating, "Climate change has global consequences for  
human  
>>>> health and the environment," the White House simply demanded removal  
of  
>>>> the  
>>>> line and all similar conclusions. At the G-8 meeting in Scotland this  
>>>> year,  
>>>> Bush successfully stymied any common action on global warming.  
>>>> Scientists,  
>>>> meanwhile, have continued to accumulate impressive data on the rising

>>>> temperature  
>>>> of the oceans, which has produced more severe hurricanes.  
>>>>  
>>>> In February 2004, 60 of the nation's leading scientists, including  
20  
>>>> Nobel laureates, warned in a statement, "Restoring Scientific Integrity  
>>>> in  
>>>> Policymaking": "Successful application of science has played a large  
>>>> part  
>>>> in the policies that have made the United States of America the world's  
>>>> most  
>>>> powerful nation and its citizens increasingly prosperous and healthy  
...  
>>>> Indeed, this principle has long been adhered to by presidents and  
>>>> administrations  
>>>> of both parties in forming and implementing policies. The administration  
>>>> of George W. Bush has, however, disregarded this principle ... The  
>>>> distortion  
>>>> of scientific knowledge for partisan political ends must cease." Bush  
>>>> completely  
>>>> ignored this statement.  
>>>>  
>>>> In the two weeks preceding the storm in the Gulf, the trumping of  
>>>> science  
>>>> by ideology and expertise by special interests accelerated. The Federal  
>>>> Drug  
>>>> Administration announced that it was postponing sale of the  
>>>> morning-after  
>>>> contraceptive pill, despite overwhelming scientific evidence of its  
>>>> safety  
>>>> and its approval by the FDA's scientific advisory board. The United  
>>>> Nations  
>>>> special envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa accused the Bush administration  
of  
>>>> responsibility  
>>>> for a condom shortage in Uganda -- the result of the administration's  
>>>> evangelical  
>>>> Christian agenda of "abstinence." When the chief of the Bureau of  
>>>> Justice  
>>>> Statistics in the Justice Department was ordered by the White House  
to  
>>>> delete  
>>>> its study that African-Americans and other minorities are subject to  
>>>> racial  
>>>> profiling in police traffic stops and he refused to buckle under, he  
was  
>>>> forced out of his job. When the Army Corps of Engineers' chief  
>>>> contracting





Also, I remembered the old Aaron Allen tweak of putting a "Prefetch.bat" in startup which has the line "del C:\Windows\Prefetch\\*.\*/q" and hence clears the Windows prefetch. That actually sped up the boot process from about 4 knightrider bars to just the one.

Made a ghost. Now I'm ready to move on to loading the general Audio Apps boot, which will involve starting from the Paris Only boot, and adding Cubase and Reason. I'll have to buy the BFD one day soon too...

Cheers,

Kim. I do indeed work in the industry. No denials, no apologies. If I am stereotyped for not automatically assuming that every anti-industry viewpoint is valid, then so be it.....again no apologies. I do question both sides. If you have read some of my posts here you might discover that I'm a somewhat reluctant conservative, perhaps siding with the least dangerous of the two evils I see and seeing very little in the middle that looks reasonable to me.

"JimT" <JT@sansun.com> wrote in message news:43174724\$1@linux...

>

> No disrespect intended DJ, but your response just reinforced the stereotype

> of someone who works in the industry.

>

>

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

>>

>> "gene lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message

>> news:43171cbd\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> Has anyone noticed that after working five years on the new White House

>>> sponsored

>>> energy bill, the U.S. Congress passed a bill that fails to reduce

>>> America's

>>> dependence on oil, fails to address the threat of global warming, fails

>>> to

>>> make any significant new investments in clean energy, and fails to help

>>> consumers

>>> at the gas pump.

>>> What it did do includes:

>>> Grants the oil and gas industries an exemption for their construction

>>> activities

>>> from compliance with Clean Water Act.

>>> Increases America's oil dependence by 130,000 barrels of oil per day in

>>> 2014

>>> through extending the 'dual-fuel' loophole.

>>> Authorized billions in new subsidies to the oil industry. (Who are all

>>> showing

> >> record profits without the government bonuses.)  
> >> Give away billions in unrelated pork fat. (The biggest giveaway of all  
> >time.)  
> >>  
> >> The list of pork fat is too long and too funny for me to list but my  
> >personal  
> >> favorites are:  
> >>  
> >> Giving \$800 million for companies in Texas and Louisiana to compensate  
> >for  
> >> their phase out of the gasoline additive MTBE, which studies have  
> >concluded  
> >> contaminates ground water and causes cancer.  
> >> Since we will now longer allow you to poison us we will give you \$800  
> >million  
> >> for your trouble. "Coincidentally", the Bush family has considerable  
> >holdings  
> >> in one of the companies.  
> >  
> >FYI, MTBE is an additive that the environmental lobby \*insisted\* on the  
> >refineries adding to fuel because it reduced certain emissions levels. It  
> >was never tested properly before this was legislated. Turns out it was  
> >bad  
> >shit and how the oil companies are being sued for it when they only did  
> >it  
> >because it was federally mandated.  
> >  
> >> Not only opening up parts of the Alaska Wildlife Refuge, but also  
> >similar  
> >> areas in Wyoming. Why Wyoming?. "Coincidentally", the Chaney family has  
> >future  
> >> Oil/mineral rights to some of this property.  
> >  
> >> There are huge natural gas reserves in Wyoming on the eastern slope of  
> >the  
> >rocky mountains. One of the biggest known ones is right outside of  
> >Glacier  
> >National park. You gotta go where the gas is to get it. The fact that  
> >Cheney  
> >> owns mineral rights there is certainly fortunate fro Cheney, but he's  
> >from  
> >> Wyoming. I doubt he moved his family there 3 or four generations ago just  
> >> because he knew that someday we would have high natural gas prices.  
> >  
> >> His brother is a surveyor in this area and I have worked with him before.  
> >If  
> >> Cheney is anything like his brother, it might be a good thing to get to  
> >> know him before casting stones. Yeh.....I know.....its the

Halliburton

> >thing, right?

> >

> >>

> >> In 2003, if you bought a Toyota Hybrid and owned a business you would  
> have

> >> received \$450 in tax reduction from the IRS because of its energy  
> >efficiency.

> >> If you bought a Hummer H1 (7 miles per gallon) and owned a business,  
you

> >> would have received aprox. \$30,000 in tax reduction from the IRS.

(Public

> >> outcry has recently forced the closure of this tax loophole.)

> >

> >Most of the folks around here who own Hummers are tree huggers. (Just a  
> >little perspective)

> >

> >;o)

> >>

> >> Gene

> >>

> >> P.S. DJ - I agree. Our countries largest vulnerability is our absolute  
> >reliance

> >> on our current energy model. Any time our oil sources are negatively  
> >effected

> >> we go into an instant recession. This essentially enslaves us to the  
large

> >> foreign oil producers and causes the "need" for Big-Stick diplomacy.

> >>

> >> Unfortunately we are about to come to a critical fork in the road.

> >>

> >> The people who will profit the most will be pushing the idea that we  
must

> >> reduce or remove all environmental constraints on energy suppliers to  
> help

> >> us achieve independence and keep our economy working. This will help  
make

> >> many of them even richer and will shorten the time before we completely  
> >run

> >> out of US oil reserves, but will also cause tremendous health issues  
and

> >> will result in serious environmental impacts. Some of this already  
> >started.

> >> Only a national level push for new energy sources and energy  
independence,

> >> similar to the 1960s push to go to the moon, will help us now.

> >> That plus having a White House and Congress that actually cares more  
about

> >> saving our economy then their personal wealth.  
> >> Gene  
> >>  
> >  
> >  
>> The environmentalists got onboard with MTBE because the additive companies  
> presented the information on the positive impact, while covering up known  
> problems with cancer and ground pollution.

Gene.....with all due respect to you, I know quite a few environmental activists and not a single one would \*get onboard\* something like this and take the additive companies at their word on anything.. This is finger pointing spin. Consider the source. I'm not saying that MTBE is a good thing and that the money. The fact that it's the California State legislature, arguably the most corrupt and partisan outside of New York and Texas, I'd say there is plenty of room to question the source.

"gene lennon" <genelennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message news:43174f9e\$1@linux...

>  
> "DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:  
> >FYI, MTBE is an additive that the environmental lobby \*insisted\* on the  
> >refineries adding to fuel because it reduced certain emissions levels. It  
> >was never tested properly before this was legislated. Turns out it was  
bad  
> >shit and how the oil companies are being sued for it when they only did  
> it  
> >because it was federally mandated.  
> >  
> This may be true but it is an interesting perspective on the history.  
> The environmentalists got onboard with MTBE because the additive companies  
> presented the information on the positive impact, while covering up known  
> problems with cancer and ground pollution.

---

Subject: Re: No One Can Say They Didn't See It Coming  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Fri, 02 Sep 2005 16:24:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t;  
>> "uptown jimmy" <johnson314@bellsouth.net> wrote:  
>>> I tend to agree on this point. The first thing that started really scaring  
>>> me was the fact that the governer of LA was near hysterics in a televised  
>>> news conference. That was Tuesday, and things have gotten much worse since  
>>> then. And the mayor of NO doesn't seem entirely competent to handle the  
>>> situation, either...to put it nicely...

>>>  
>>> LA leadership is not up the task, never could have been. It's just so  
>>> obvious the whole place got caught with a uppercut it never bothered to  
>> take  
>>> seriously.  
>>>  
>>> It is unconscionable, however, how slow and lazy the Federal response has  
>>> been. The various leaders of various agencies, including our not-so-esteemed  
>>> boy king, have spent more time making excuses, it seems, than in making  
>>> things better.  
>>>  
>>> I am simply horrified with what is unfolding. The political repercussions  
>>> will be massive. I predict the head of FEMA will be jobless very soon.  
>>>  
>>> Jimmy  
>>>  
>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:43186e80\$1@linux...  
>>>  
>>>> I'm with you.  
>>>>  
>>>> The president is not an inspiring leader at times of diaster, but this  
>>>> f\*ckup has to be laid at the feet of the tradition of corruption and  
>>>> poor government in NO. They knew exactly what would happen  
>>>> to the levies, they knew exactly how deep the water would be and  
>>>> where it would go. Why was there not an effective emergency  
>>>> plan? Where was the local leadership? When NO needed a  
>>>> Giuliani they got a worthless whiner and no plan. Bush was slow,  
>>>> as he usually is. No excuses. But compared to the city and state  
>>>> bozos he is a paragon of virtue.  
>>>>  
>>>> DC  
>>>  
>>>  
>>

---