Subject: It takes a Smpte to MTC converter to record digitally seriously ?
Posted by andrea perini on Sat, 09 Jul 2005 07:37:49 GMT

ing any worse than anyone else in
respect
> to this. We live in a world where every country seems to trip up little
old
> ladies when it suits, and help them across the road when it suits to do
that.
> Point is when I see this pattern I don't buy any good guy stuff. Yes, it
> was the right thing to do. No, I don't beleive it was done *because* it
was
> the right thing to do, because that pattern just doesn't fit.
>
> >Again, is the US the only one responsible?
>
> No, and as above I'm not trying to blame the U.S. I'm merely pointing out
> that in a world where everyone with no exceptions trips up some

Subject: Re: It takes a Smpte to MTC converter to record digitally seriously ?
Posted by Andy Pow on Sat, 09 Jul 2005 12:55:37 GMT

e/0,,2087-1669640,00.html
>>
>>
>
>Whoa. Neil, buddy, you just lost my vote for president. ;^)

I sincerely hope our current leadership does not think like that.

Your approach has been tried in Israel on a smaller scale. There they
bulldozed houses of families of suspected bombers. Didn't work. The
resentment grew and consequently more bombers appeared. It may have made
it easier to recruit bombers, not the intended consequence.

The only way your idea would "work" would be to nuke every city on the
planet, which is what your "solution" would tend toward as the mutual
resentments grew. Then the problem would go away, so you're partially
right, although no human would be around to enjoy the ensuing
radioactive calm.

That whole approach is a "wizard's apprentice" idea. Simplistic but
fraught with unintended consequences.

Cheers,

-Jamie K
http://www.JamieKrutz.com

PS. We don't need to make this into "Return of the Crusades." We ought
to be a bit more enlightened at this point in history.

Neil wrote:

> "Mike Audet" <mike@mike....com> wrote:
>
>>I do believe that Bush is one evil sonofabitch. There was an article in
>

Subject: Re: It takes a Smpte to MTC converter to record digitally seriously ?
Posted by Rod Lincoln on Sat, 09 Jul 2005 13:54:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

ntion
>>on it long enough to complete a sentence. I'm being completely serious
>
> about this.
>
> He stammers all the time... I don't buy this - it's very
> subjective, but I'll try & notice the next time he speaks about
> something.
>
>
>
>>The trouble with nuking cities is that it will only escalate the violence.
>
>
> Nope, one terrorist bombing = one Islamic city nuked. Two
> bombings = two cities nuked. How long do you think it would
> take before the entire Islamic world turned over every
> terrorist? Not long. Not all of them believe in being
> martyrs... many of them just want to live thier lives just like
> we do and some of those people are harboring terrorists just
> because there's no retribution.. once the retribution starts,
> we'd see how many of them want to harbor those bastards any
> longer. Fuck the

Subject: Re: It takes a Smpte to MTC converter to record digitally seriously?
Posted by audioguy_nospam_ on Sat, 09 Jul 2005 15:41:35 GMT

gt;Does PARIS support MIDI clock? Is MTC a better sync source?
>
>
>respect
>NappyThat clears it up for me!
Thanks for the quick reply!

respect
Nappy

"Mike Audet" <mike@MikeF-SPAMAudet.com> wrote:
>
>Midi clock is basically a midi note sent every quarter note. It may encode
>the time signature, too, but I'm not sure. PARIS does not support it.
>
>Since SMPTE sends 30 frames per second and MIDI clocks is only one frame
>per beat, SMPTE/MTC is much tighter.
>
>MIDI clocks are stil useful, though, to sync external effects to the tempo
>of a song witout having to program delay times.
>
>I hope this clears it up. :)
>
>Mike
>
>"Nappy" <mgrant01@san.rr.com> wrote:
>>
>>Does PARIS support MIDI clock? Is MTC a better sync source?
>>
>>
>>respect
>>Nappy
>First of all, I wanna thank you all: I've been away this NG for much time
but I'm happy to find back this warm, friendly, lively environment...

Rod, I'm veeery sorry, the DAT was actually a Tascam DA 30 !! Anyway, my
goal is to check if the 442 modified by an authorized (former) Ensoniq
laboratory works or not, 'cause, as I wrote, the first attempt without a
Smpte to MTC converter turned solely to crashes

Subject: Re: It takes a Smpte to MTC converter to record digitally seriously
Posted by Mike Audet on Sat, 09 Jul 2005 15:48:12 GMT

and noises...

I've called right now a couple of pros here in my region : one said there would be no need of any converter because the sample rate signal passing through the spdif would be enough to record digital data; the other said that is very likely that the manual is right, because he said without the converter the square waves of the master and the slave wouldn't likely be in phase, turning to conflicts...

I think #2 is right, and I'll look for the JL Cooper suggested by the friend Andy Pow

Thank You

Dave(EK Sound) <audioguy_nospam_@shaw.ca> wrote in message 42cff025@linux...
> I'm a bit confused as to what you are trying too do. The
> DA-88 outputs 8 channels of T-DIF which is very similar to
> AES. The IF442 only has a single 2 channel SPDIF input.
> The two are not really compatible as far as a direct digital
> transfer is concerned. Then if you want to "lock" the Paris
> transport to the DA-88 to do multiple passes, you will need
> a sync card (SY88) in the DA-88 to send MTC to the MIDI
> interface on the Paris computer (you will need a MIDI
> interface on your Paris Computer for this). Then you can
> simply lock the Paris transport to the DA-88 as Andy
> described in the other post.
>
> Give us a little more detail on what it is you are trying to
> do exactly.
>
> David.
>
> andrea perini wrote:
> > Hi all,
> >
> > The only time I tried to record digitally from a TASCAM DA88 into the
IF-442
> > it's been a fiasco. I've even modified the 442 in order to get a 2.5 v
p-p
> > flow instead of the original 0.5 v p-p.
> > Today I'm waiting a friend with his Tascam here, and we're gonna try
again
> > with the MEC, this time.
> > I've read the Paris' manual more carefully, and (please tell me if I'm
>

Subject: Re: It takes a Smpte to MTC converter to record digitally seriously
Posted by Deej [3] on Sat, 09 Jul 2005 16:09:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

but the last person
who for a moment will be ecstatic over their victory, til they realize
there is no one left to share it with.

On 9 Jul 2005 18:01:28 +1000, "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
>Dedric Terry <dedric@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>No one understands a
>>country they don't live in like a native
>
>This is kind of true, but really, it comes back to the beer point I made
>earlier. Nobody understands their local beer like the locals, but honestly,
>if you want to know beer you have to taste 1,000 of them. Otherwise you don't
>have any perspective upon which to base your opinion. Without outside influence
>and experience you'll tend to just assume the way you're living is right
>and normal. If you grow up where abuse is the norm, you will likely be that
>way too, and not understand how things could be different. Until you have
>experienced many cultures you don't truly have any perspective upon which
>to look at your own culture. Even though you know it, you know nothing else,
>hence you have no perspective upon it. This worries me a little about the
>states, that the U.S. generally stays fairly self contained and isolated...
> I think not as much on this group as generally, but that is the pattern.
>If you look up figures on things like where people holiday, and as I said
>before, what media people watch, you'll find that the U.S. tends to keep
>to itself. I think generally people on this group are fairly broadminded
>compared to their average countryman, possibly in part because discussions
>like this have been going for quite a while here. I would certainly admit
>I've learned a lot about the perspectives of many in the process, and I'm
>sure I'm not the only one.
>
>>Case in point: for us here in the US, Australia is where Crocodile Dundee
>>came from, and where the deadliest snakes, insects and ocean live dwell
>>-
>>making for a very scary place, especially if you go on a walk-about alone
>in
>>search of Kiwi and Koalas. ;-) (a little lightening of the mood).
>
>I can assure you that the biggest threat to me right now is that my housemate
>might get drunk and smash a bottle. ;o)
>
>
>>As far as other brutal leaderships - perhaps you are referring to
>
>I'm not referring to anyone really... just that there's a long list, and

>indeed some of the brutal leaderships are listed as allies by, well, lots

---

Subject: R: It takes a Smpte to MTC converter to record digitally seriously?
Posted by andrea perini on Sat, 09 Jul 2005 19:41:29 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

 mistake by going into Iraq...
>that we were hornswaggled, as they say - conned by the Iraqi's
>who are NOW in power, and who had their own agenda against
>Saddam. Now, with these latest bombings, I'm back to being
>all about retribution, since massive force is the only thing
>these extremists seem to understand - or if they don't
>understand it, at least we'll lower their numbers & limit their
>capabilities by that method. So I'm now thinking that a good
>position would be: for every terrorist attack that occurs
>against us or one of our allies, we should nuke an Islamic city.
>One bomb - done. Next? Oh you want to bomb another embassy? OK,
>fine, there goes another Islamic city... bigger bomb this time.
>Trust me, that kind of shit wouldn't last too long before we
>had peace on earth & goodwill towards all men for a good long
>time.
>
>Neil
>
>
>
>Neil
>
>"Mike Audet" <mike@mike......com> wrote:
>>
>>Hi Mr. Simplicity,
>>
>>Unfortunately, Iraq is very much about oil for the US - big US oil companies.
>> And, leaving Iraqi oil in the ground, or burning it in bombed pipelines
>>is exactly what they want to do. This whole war was about destabilizing
>>the Middle East so that oil prices would rise and make billions for George's
>>friends, screwing everyone else in the process.
>>
>>Osama has publicly said that his mission is to bankrupt the US the same
>way
>>that he feels he bankrupted the USSR in Afghanistan as payback for Israeli/US

>>
>>Just like Osama, Bush and his friends want to bankrupt the US government
>>in several ways, too: they want to give as much money as possible to their

---

>>corporate friends through reconstruction projects and military contracts,
>>they want to dismantle, as much as possible, what little social safety-net
>>the US has, and they want to bleed the American people directly with high
>>gas and oil prices.
>>
>>The best way to end social spending and bring the US back to the early 1900s
>>economically (which seems to be part of the conservative ideology) is to

>>job.
>>
>>The

Subject: Re: It takes a Smpte to MTC converter to record digitally seriously?
Posted by Martin Harrington on Sun, 10 Jul 2005 00:31:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

quot;Mr Simplicity" <animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote:
> >You must have one or you will die.
>
> See? Hear that?!? Told you it wasn't in my head! ;o)
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.Hey DC, welcome back!

Thanks for repeating your same old same old. Now the thread is complete. ;^)

How goes the book?

Cheers,
 -Jamie K
 http://www.JamieKrutz.com

DC wrote:

> Hey guys,
>
> Jumped back in to see how you all are doing, and it's the same dang
> conversation we had last year...
>
> heh heh
>
>
> Here's what we know.
>

> Rewarding terror brings more terror.   (thanks Spain!)
>
> Ghandi was wrong. Sometimes war brings peace.
>
> And the beatings will continue until the terrorism stops...
>
>
> It's easy to be an intellectual when someone else is doing the dying..
>
>
> (Don's corollary:
>
> It's easy to be an equipment snob with someone else's money...)
>
>
> DC
>
> BTW, what did the G8 just give the Palestinians?   50 billion??
>
> Who says bombing innocent civilians doesn't pay?
>
>
>"erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote:
>It seems that we all have been brainwashed by Deej here! ;o)

AHA! So you can hear him too!! See I knew it wasn't just me!

;o)

Cheers,
Kim.Hey Jamie,

That was just a generalized response to the reactionary approach the
previous poster had taken. The point was, I really think (and did before
the war talk started) that there is more to the story than has, or probably
ever will be publicized - we'll never know for sure either way.

The poster had come across sounding like Iraqis were doing just fine before
we went in but are a mess now because of us and no one else - and the poster
doesn't like Bush (to each their own of course). I'm sure the hundreds of
thousands of Iraqis that were tortured or killed under Saddam's regime might
disagree about their apparent well-being at the time. Certainly the
country's infrastructure and economy were better off before the war. War is
devastating no matter how you look at it.

Both sides of the circumstances sadden me - tyrannical rule is more than
anyone should have to endure, and certainly would be more than most
Americans could bear in our desire to have no one guide, much less restrict

our personal decisions; and if war is the only way to be free (as our predecessors found in the 1700's), freedom comes at a high price. As a country we've paid such a price many times - Rev. War, Civil War, WWI, WWII, Korea, Veitnam, etc. It never gets easy. It is never glorious. My hope now is that the outcome for the Iraqi people is freedom to make their own decisions about who governs them and how - free from tyranny, and free from anarchist insurgents. I'm just not sure many people think there is any cost worth paying anymore. After all, $2.39 a gallon or which movie to go see is about the highest cost most people have to weigh out here in the US (by comparison to many other countries with far greater struggles in their pathes). With such a gift of opportunity for life here comes a great responsibility, one that I think we are losing perspective on as a country (as much of the world is also). Sometimes we will take on too much sho

---

Subject: R: It takes a Smpte to MTC converter to record digitally seriously?
Posted by andrea perini on Sun, 10 Jul 2005 14:38:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

reat, let's keep in touch on
that. Also, if you're going to be heading to Denver give me a shout. If
I'm heading for the Springs I'll let you know.

You're right about not knowing everything. A lot of arguments made here
hinge on speculation. War is often sold as the price for freedom, but
the sellers are not always correct or even sincere. As responsible
voters we must be able to see through smoke screens, rationalizations
and lies, but that's often hard except through hindsight.

Past experience teaches us to carefully examine the many motivations for
war, not all of which are in the same lofty category as "the price of
freedom." There are other ways to help ensure freedom that are less
destructive and have less damaging consequences and those, too, must be
considered. Violence breeds violence and that consequence must be taken
into account as we try to find the wisest, most effective course of
action toward the better world we all want. Complacency is not an option.

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

Dedric Terry wrote:

> Hey Jamie,
>
> That was just a generalized response to the reactionary approach the

> previous poster had taken. The point was, I really think (and did before
> the war talk started) that there is more to the story than has, or probably
> ever will be publicized - we'll never know for sure either way.
>
> The poster had come across sounding like Iraqis were doing just fine before
> we went in but are a mess now because of us and no one else - and the poster
> doesn't like Bush (to each their own of course). I'm sure the hundreds of
> thousands of Iraqis that were tortured or killed under Saddam's regime might
> disagree about their apparent well-being at the time. Certainly the
> country's infrastructure and economy were better off before the war. War is
> devastating no matter how you look at it.
>
> Both sides of the circumstances sadden me - tyrannical rule is more than
> anyone should have to endure, and certainly would be more than most
> Americans could bear in our desire to have no one guide, much less restrict
> our personal decisions; and if war is the only way to be free (as our
> predecessors found in the 1700's), freedom comes at a high price. As a
> country we've paid such a price many times - Rev. War, Civil War, WWI, WWII,
> Korea, Veitnam, etc. It never gets easy. It is never glorious. My hope
> now is that the outcome for the Iraqi people is freedom to make their own
> decisions about who governs them and how - free from tyranny, and free from
> anarchist insurgents. I'm just not sure many people think there is any cost
> worth paying anymore. After all, $2.39 a gallon or which movie to go see is
> about the highest cost most people have to weigh out here in the US (by
> comparison to many other countries with far greater struggles in their
> pathes). With such a gift of opportunity for life here comes a great
> responsibility, one that I think we are losing perspective on as a country
> (as much of the world is also). Sometimes we will take on too much
> shouldering of that responsibility, and sometimes not enough, or not enough
> of the right things, or the right way.
>
> I don't know if we've made all the right decisions - war isn't a decision
> that makes sense at the time in light of the loss and devastation it brings
> - it only disrupts one course to put another in motion. The best we can do
> before hand is speculate whether the current course is destined for tragedy
> or not. After the fact, only time will tell what the new course will bring,
> but we never know if left as-is what would have happened. So, we have no
> definitive answer - esp. when put on a human scale. We didn't have a chart
> that told us what number of Jews had to die before Hitler needed to be
> stopped. We didn't have a chart for Iraq either, and made the assumption
> there were direct threat dangers there - the true answer will never be known
> (WMD could be in Syria, or not at all; Saddam was working on building nukes,
> but whether that was destined to become a dire threat if left unchecked,
> with or without sanctions, we'll never know). What cost has to be paid
> before there is justification for force? No one really has the answer to
> that - it's an imposs