

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

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004–09/4249.html>

From: Kevin Aylward (salesEXTRACT_at_anasoft.co.uk)

Date: 09/19/04

Date: Sun, 19 Sep 2004 00:30:59 GMT

John Fields wrote:

> *On Sat, 18 Sep 2004 19:08:00 GMT, "Kevin Aylward"*

> *<salesEXTRACT@anasoft.co.uk> wrote:*

>

>> *John Fields wrote:*

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

>>> *<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.*

> ----