

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

**Source:** <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004–09/4187.html>

---

**From:** John Fields ([jfields\\_at\\_austininstruments.com](mailto:jfields_at_austininstruments.com))

**Date:** 09/18/04

Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 15:59:10 -0500

On Sat, 18 Sep 2004 19:08:00 GMT, "Kevin Aylward"  
<[salesEXTRACT@anasoft.co.uk](mailto:salesEXTRACT@anasoft.co.uk)> wrote:

>*John Fields wrote:*

>> *On Sat, 18 Sep 2004 17:34:20 GMT, "Kevin Aylward"*

>> *<[salesEXTRACT@anasoft.co.uk](mailto:salesEXTRACT@anasoft.co.uk)> wrote:*

>>

>>> *Clarence wrote:*

>>

>>>> *Just delete the entire thing, then no one can complain!*

>>>

>>> *In a way, I sort of agree, in the sense, that most of what I am*

>>> *writing should be trivially obvious, requiring no explanation at*

>>> *all. i.e.*

>>>

>>> *"That which is mostly observed, is that which replicates the most."*

>>>

>>> *The papers are knee high just to explain this, and what it means.*

>>> *Unfortunately, all those religious individuals don't see the forest*

>>> *for the trees are in the way.*

>>

>> ----

>> *So what? Your job, as a writer, is to recognize and overcome that*

>> *roadblock if you want your ideas to come alive in the minds of your*

>> *readers, not to come up with excuses why you can't.*

>

>*I agree. If someone points out a valid issue. I will address it.*

>*However, this has been blown way out of all proportion.*

---

What's happened is that it's gotten past the point where you can control it because you consider the judgement on the validity of an issue to be solely yours to make.

---

>> Religious and political views contrary to your own, a poor command of  
>> the language,

>

>*I do not have a "poor" command of the English language in the slightest.*

>*I have an \*average\* command of the English language. Do you have any*

sci.electronics.design: Re: Ping Kevin Aylward – re your "scientific paper"

>idea just how many are illiterate?

---

On these newsgroups, none. However, being somewhat better than the worst isn't much of an accomplishment!^)

---

>I just write more, so there are more visible mistakes.

---

That's hardly fair. If I write 100 words and make one error and you write 200 and make three, that doesn't excuse the extra error just because you wrote twice as much as I did.

Besides, it's not just a question of the number of errors, it's also about the quality of the errors. Something like ten typos are equivalent to a tense error or two mis-spellings...

---

>Being "not good" is not being "bad". There is a middle ground. Its so >easy, to ignore the 99% that's right when only 1% is wrong. The 1% >failures are what stick out. If I design 100 circuits and one fails, am >I a bad designer?

---

Depends...

All of your timer designs worked in the field except the one which was supposed to time the deployment of automotive airbags.

What do you think?

---

>That's why this whole thread is joke. If I was as bad as what the >overall feel is coming across in this thread, I would be spending all >day slapping my wrist with my other left hand.

---

I don't think anyone's saying you're all that bad;^) What seems to have happened is that you got defensive and copped an attitude when your paper started being criticized and when it got to the English part you were trapped and just couldn't let go.

---

>>and on and on, ad infinitum, are all roadblocks you must >> overcome if you expect to be read in the way you want to be read.

>> ---

>>

>>> The other issue, is that one's wives don't want to accept that we men >>> shag as many other women as possible when ever we can, either. They >>> just dont want to buy into that we are inherently programmed by our >>> genes to acting in said manner...

>>

>> ---

>> Ah, yesssss!!!

>>

>> "Well, your honor, I had that box of matches, so what else was I >> supposed to do???" ;^)

>

>Indeed.

:~)

--

John Fields