

Re: OT: Why welfare doesn't work!

Re: OT: Why welfare doesn't work!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-09/msg01605.html>

- *From:* bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Thu, 11 Sep 2008 04:35:47 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Sep 11, 6:40 pm, "Michael A. Terrell" <mike.terr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On Sep 11, 3:20 am, "Michael A. Terrell" <mike.terr...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

Jim Thompson wrote:

Poor baby, you're just full of
excuses. No one will hire
you because
you're incompetent. Face up
to it, go over and sit in the
corner and
suck your thumb ;-)

Jim-out-of-touch-reality-Thompson
thinks I'm not being hired because
I'm incompetent. When he expresses an
opinion outside of electronic
design he's wrong almost all the time, and
he's failed to get it right
this time too.

This is another example of why people give you so much
shit. You

Re: OT: Why welfare doesn't work!

can't just say you disagree with Jim, you have to be the biggest asshole on the newsgroup about it.

There's a lot of competition for the that particular honour. Jim's a leading contender – nobody else admits to having reported one of us to the FBI for "dangerously anti-American" attitudes.

I'm sure you America bashing posts had already been detected by more than one government agency.

Even the dimmest of the US government agencies wouldn't be silly enough to regard my kind of America-bashing as any kind of threat. You and Jim can't afford to be a little less realistic.

Your contributions about my career are pathetic exercises in malicious imaginative fiction, so you don't really compete. Phil Allison is seriously obnoxious, but since he doesn't seem to be actively malicious – as Jim is – he's has to settle for second place.

Don't sell yourself short. Phil is only a contender, when compared to your level of being obnoxious.

You may think so. Your opinion isn't exactly definitive.

Jim is working.

Lucky him.

You aren't.

I've noticed.

So have we, and all your prospective employers who did a search on your name. Then they saw the real you, and didn't hire you.

Re: OT: Why welfare doesn't work!

Re: OT: Why welfare doesn't work!

You do enjoy your little fantasies.

Jim is working state of the art.

Barry Gilbert and Geoff Widlar comes a lot closer to defining the state of the art. Jim works for people who can't afford to have someone that good on the staff. I've used a few of Jim's designs, and dumped them gratefully when someone else did the job right.

And you use you pink and purple UFO to visit 'Nessie' every day. One of Earl Schibe's best paint jobs, BTW.

You do enjoy your little fantasies. You don't find reality nearly as satisfying.

You barely remember the art. Every time you post another attack on someone's skills, it shows how little you are capable of comprehending, these days.

As if Mike Terrell would know. He does technician's engineer–envy to perfection, with the obligatory element of not knowing what is actually going on – as evidenced by his adulation of Jim's journeyman skills.

Yawn. I didn't envy the engineers. In fact, I despised some of them for releasing half finished designs to the floor. That was why I was transferred to the engineering department before their first DSP based design was released to production. The design worked, but was a nightmare to build and test. My job was to fix that, and I did it. I pissed off some of the older engineers, but the manufacturing engineers backed me up, and the production, and test departments were pleased with the changes. Some of the engineers were top notch, and others reminded me of you. They were the ones let go in the first layoffs.

I'm no fan of sloppy engineers either, and I've done my fair share of cleaning up after them. Your ever–complaisant imagination tells you that I was one of them. Enjoy your little fantasy.

Re: OT: Why welfare doesn't work!

Re: OT: Why welfare doesn't work!

I knew some of our other products better than the current engineers did. I wrote so many request for engineering change orders on them that I was banned from engineering. It lasted a whole two days before they needed help on one of those products.

I'm sure that quite a few of your engineering change orders were on the money when it came to identify that there was a problem. Very few of the engineering change orders I had to process managed to propose a change which would have solved the problem identified, but you might have done better than average.

Rather than ask questions about new technology, you drone on about the antiques you worked on. How often do they sell a brand new Electron Microscope built on a 35 year old design?

I was working at Cambridge Instruments when they revolutionised scanning electron microscope design by using a computer – eventually a PC – to do the detailed knob-twiddling. That was around 1985, some 23 years ago now. I am aware that things have changed since then, as you'd know if you could understand the technical stuff that I do post.

Don't flatter yourself, Bill. Your idea of technical 'stuff' is a sick joke. Computer controlled instrumentation is the norm, these days..

It was pretty common back then, but electron microscopes are tolerably complicated beasts with some nasty habits – when the 30kV voltage at the cathode happens to flash over to ground you get big currents circulating through the ground connections. Making sure that this was non-destructive wasn't entirely trivial.

If anyone is out of touch with reality it's you, for thinking your outdated skills still matter. You should join one of the European antique radio newsgroups. There you might find someone who appreciates your out of date skills.

I got into electronics when planar transistors had become cheap and widely available, used one of the first MOSFETs to go on the market, and went on to take advantage of every new development I could lay my

Re: OT: Why welfare doesn't work!

hands on. My most marketable skill has always been finding new ways to solve problems, and that is a skill that isn't likely to go out of date.

I 'got into' electronics when it was mostly tube, but made the transition to solid state by reading the used EE college textbooks I picked up at thrift stores. A lot of the engineers I've worked with wanted to know why I didn't have a degree. I spotted problems, and provided the solutions, rather than just whine about something not working.

The Peltier-junction-based thermostat I put together in 1993 was the first published design to use a microcontroller to deal with the control problem posed by the fact that the watt-per-amp efficacy of a Peltier junction changes with the temperature difference across it. Jim Williams' subsequent application note for the LTC1923 refers to the problem, but doesn't include the equation to work out what the efficacy actually is (as my paper did – and I had to derive it for myself, not that it was all that complicated to do). I still hope to get a chance to do something else equally interesting.

Not that you'd have clue about what I'm talking about.

Yawn. Tell everything you know me about DSP based diversity telemetry receivers, the FIR filters, the firmware, or the digital spectrum display that was mostly software based. How about the 90 MHz A/D converters that followed the analog microwave tuners? Ever design one? FWIW, have you ever even seen one? that receiver had over a dozen processors doing various jobs.

I've not yet worked on telemetry receivers. The multiphase stroboscopic electron microscope I worked on from 1988 to 1993 did incorporate a fast 8-bit A/D converter. It was a nominally 100MHz part, though we didn't run it faster than 50MHz, limited mainly by the ECL-based digital signal processing hardware that I specified and whose design and development I supervised. The timing side of the system ran much faster, with an 800MHz clock for coarse timing and analog interpolation to get us down to 10psec increments (though the jitter on the 800MHz clock that actually worked meant that this was never all that useful on the prototype).

You played with a simple electronic cooler. Was it certified for space applications, or approved by NASA for life critical missions?

Re: OT: Why welfare doesn't work!

No. It just went into hospitals and biology labs. And it wasn't a cooler, but a thermostat – we needed 0.01 degree (Celcius) stability, and we got ± 0.001 C. And we had to do both heating and cooling to stabilise the samples at various temperatures from 38C (body temperature) down to about 10C, though US and European room temperatures (25C and 20C) were the most popular. That temperature range made the variation in the efficacy of the Peltier junction an issue that did have to be dealt with.

Like I said, you haven't got a clue.

—

Bill Sloman, Nijmegen

.