

# Re: [OT]: Ping Kevin Aylward – re your "scientific paper"

**Source:** <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004–09/4156.html>

---

**From:** Don Pearce ([donald\\_at\\_pearce.uk.com](mailto:donald_at_pearce.uk.com))

**Date:** 09/18/04

Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 19:58:14 GMT

On Sat, 18 Sep 2004 20:48:04 +0100, John Woodgate  
<[jmw@jmwa.demon.contrasпам.yuk](mailto:jmw@jmwa.demon.contrasпам.yuk)> wrote:

>> *Theory has been tested, and hence can be used to predict an outcome  
>> reliably. Conjecture is what the bloke down the pub tells you.  
>>  
> Kevin's original stuff is clearly hypothesis, because he doesn't, AFAIK,  
> have any opportunity to carry out any confirmatory tests (even if  
> ethical tests could be devised in this context). But, since it's derived  
> from Darwin and others, it is not 'conjecture', which needs no 'prior  
> art' basis at all.*

He certainly makes reference to Darwin, but I see no evidence that anything he proposes is actually based on Darwin's work. His Darwinian reference are more in the nature of analogy than anything else. So conjecture is still a fair description.

d

Pearce Consulting

<http://www.pearce.uk.com>