

## Re: How inaccurate is a 555 or 7555 REALLY?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-12/msg01330.html>

---

- *From:* [bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx](mailto:bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 5 Dec 2006 16:48:12 -0800
- 

John Fields wrote:

On 4 Dec 2006 17:19:45 -0800, bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx wrote:

John Fields wrote:

On 3 Dec 2006 15:10:27 -0800, bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx wrote:

My own idea of my  
attitude on this news group is "polite until  
provoked"

---  
Which generally manifests itself as provocation =  
disagreement.  
---

but John Larkin  
does keep on finding insults in my posts that  
I could have sworn  
weren't there when I composed them (and  
don't look much like insults to  
me when I reread them).

---  
Which is about the double standard you exact. If, in fact,  
your  
posts are made without rancor, which is ridiculous on its  
face, you  
insist that what must then be "carelessness" on your part be  
not

Re: How inaccurate is a 555 or 7555 REALLY?

interpreted as insult, but that infinite care be taken with  
correspondence directed to you in order that you not interpret  
it as  
insult.

Of course, if you could find an example where I was unreasonably easily  
provoked, or "accidentally" produced a grievous insult, you'd quote it,  
thus converting a pointless troll into something worth reading.

Just because I can't be bothered to slog through the morass of your  
posting history in order to find an example of your nasty attitude  
certainly doesn't mean there aren't thousands of examples out there.

Your search skills aren't exactly impressive, but the intelligent  
reader will still conclude that there are many fewer than thousands of  
examples out there, with the likeliest number being zero. Since I seem  
only to have cranked out 6520 postings over the past ten years, there  
is an upper limit to the examples that you could find.

Phil Allison would blame this on autism, but  
he  
blames a lot of stuff on autism. He's not an  
expert psychologist,  
unlike my wife's academic colleagues (who  
won't use me as a test  
subject any more, because I know too  
much).

More than likely that's what they tell you in order to dismiss  
you  
gracefully and to keep from hurting your wife, to whom you  
must  
certainly be an embarrassment.

If you say so John – since you don't know my wife or her colleagues,  
you are free to let your imagination run wild. Pity you haven't got an  
imagination that can usefully exploit this lack of factual restraint,  
let alone any more modern electronic component than the 555.

Re: How inaccurate is a 555 or 7555 REALLY?

Re: How inaccurate is a 555 or 7555 REALLY?

It's true that I don't know them, but knowing you is enough to know how they'd behave if they were nice people who had to but up with an overbearing know-it-all like you.

They are (mostly) nice people, but probably even better-informed in their subjects than I am in mine – not the sort of company that you seem to keep, let alone know anything about.

I'm working on a project right now where I'm using an MC68HC908JL8. And you?

You've got me there. I'm just flat hunting. On the other hand the MC68HC908 is the 2002 version of Motorola's 8-bit microcontroller, going back back via the 6805 to the original 6800 from 1975. RISC and DSP seem to have passed you by.

Still hanging on to that pig-ignorant belief that a 555 is a "bad" chip which no one should use because you won't? Even when it's the perfect candidate for the job?

It isn't a "bad" chip, but very rarely an acceptable candidate for any job in serious electronics these days. There was a thread about this here a while back, and the concensus was that most professional electronic engineers don't seem to be using it any more.

—  
Bill Sloman, Nijmegen (but in Sydney at the moment).