

---

Subject: OT - Waves NPP 2.3 - any chance in XP?  
Posted by [Wilson Zorn](#) on Mon, 29 Jan 2007 16:56:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

hotmail.com" target="\_blank">excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message  
news:45f62484\$1@linux...

>  
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:  
>>What a piece of junque.  
>>  
>>;o(  
>>  
>>  
>  
> Must have been made by Apple; )LoL!! This is what the market has to offer in year 2007 wow..  
The fx are pitiful  
at best..

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:  
>What a piece of junque.  
>  
>;o(  
>  
>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:  
>What a piece of junque.  
>  
>;o(  
>

---

Subject: Re: OT - Waves NPP 2.3 - any chance in XP?  
Posted by [Wilson Zorn](#) on Tue, 30 Jan 2007 15:38:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i use SX2 mainly as a vsti/vst vehicles. when using amplitube2 on the  
> mains insert i have found that the sound is much bigger, fatter and  
> generally better than when using it on a individual channel insert.  
> have any of you? i was showing this to one of the interns here  
> yesterday and he too was amazed at the difference.  
>  
> rickOn 16 Mar 2007 06:29:16 +1000, "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:  
  
>Depression is a choice. How bad do you want to live?  
>

"Depression is a choice."

Really? Like left-handedness, bi-polar disorder, paranoid

schizophrenia, and all those other poor decisions people make...?

Breathtakingly over-simple statement, man... It would certainly be a happier world if this were true, but -- isn't and it ain't...

-- hard to know what else to say -- good luck sorting this one out without the benefit of a third dimension in your perspective -- chas. "Doug Wellington" <doug#64

---

---

Subject: Re: OT - Waves NPP 2.3 - any chance in XP?  
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Thu, 01 Feb 2007 02:40:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

we understand it,  
is real, is not agnostic, it is atheist. It is an act of faith that "science" as we know it, can explain everything. I am certain that our definition of the natural is entirely too small, and if so, as Clarke said:

"Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic"

So, of naturalism cannot explain everything, don't you think that would impact your definition of proof?

Which is it? How do you differentiate between atheism and agnosticism?

>> than those who have provided the gospel canon to us, and  
>> rejected some of the other writings, may have done so for  
>> a good reason.

>Absolutely. My belief is that that good reason was and is to control  
>the masses and indeed, keep them from true enlightenment, since  
>enlightened individuals rarely make for an orderly society.

And so, there it is. Christianity is the opiate of the masses.  
Ok, well. I certainly see where you are coming from.

Define enlightened.

>> What are your assumptions?

>(Since you asked...) :-) I believe I have articulated many of my  
>assumptions through my questions, but adding to the previous paragraph,

>and to put it in the proverbial nutshell, I am not an atheist, I do not

>believe in the inerrancy of scripture, I believe that both canonical and

>apochryphal writings have been chosen and modified knowingly and

>unknowingly by humans over the centuries for various reasons and

>agendas, and any cries of heresy are purely protectionist strategies. I

>assume that the importance of the Bible is primarily allegorical and I

>do not take the resurrection to be a literal event. How's that for a start?

That's a good start. And I much appreciate your honesty.

Being a non-atheist, would you say that you are a theist of any kind? What sort?

If not, then we have a divide we cannot bridge easily.

If it is impossible, and I believe it is, for any version of