

The all singing, all dancing, h-yprocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

It seems that Darryn took exception to my last blog post, which was a response to his earlier blog entry. Unfortunately, he decided to respond on his website ([you can read it here](#)) and unfortunately, he obviously took my comments personally, despite me trying to make sure I didn't criticise him directly but his opinion, even signalling this in the opening intro. Unfortunately, in response, I think he's decided to get a little personal...speaking of a tirade of comments from me, of being hypocritical and oh....something about dancing and jellybeans?!

I also suspect, knowing Darryn, that he may have posted on his site because he knows I probably wouldn't have allowed the post here. Don't get me wrong, I welcome...heck, enjoy, a good constructive argument. But I don't allow personal attacks or rude words (it's a family show folks) so without being able to speak for him, I speculate that's probably why it got posted there.

Of paraphrasing and quoting

See, I have this dilemma. I need to respond to Darryn's comments, but he somehow implies that if I quote just a part of his blog post, then I'm taking him out of context. I guess, as an example, here's the comment...partly quoted....

"Phil however completely and utterly removed ALL context from my post and then made his ridiculous post based on that contextless version of my post. "

Well, OK, point taken. But that's what responses are about. You don't quote the last post verbatim, you select what you want to respond to...the essence of the post...and good golly, I'm going to do it again. Another way of saying that is "get over it". But what I make sure I do, is talk to what you say. You'll see later that Darryn has added in things he claims I said (about intranets and things) that I never did. I avoid speculating and talk to the statements....and here goes!

The pundits

The all singing, all dancing, h-yocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

"My post was purely quashing the negative comments that the pundits wrote about the iPad that were largely baseless in the first place "

No it wasn't and no they aren't! It was quashing negative comments on the basis that you claimed that they got it WRONG. Not that their opinion was wrong or negative...but that they were WRONG. And why is it that you're OK with commenting on why things have been done a certain way by Apple, when you seem to think they're not entitled to provide the same speculation?

You said (I think...becuase it's starting to get confusing) that the iPad did multitasking...then changed tact and suggested why would you need it.

You said the pundits were wrong in that there was a camera in the iPad. There is no more definitive an answer to your comment "*Actually it does*", than saying that comment is wrong. And it is.

Multitasking

"Now, they were talking about multitasking in the sense of running more than one app at a time which as I correctly stated that makes no valid sense on a low power device such as a phone or a tablet. "

Umm, not sure why Darryn's chose to take me to task (or multitask?) on this one as I agreed with him when I stated....

"I totally agree with that last part...if it impacts the performance of the hardware then having multitasking on is silly. "

The all singing, all dancing, h-yprocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

Darryn started his first multitask comments by saying...

"It doesn't multitask: Umm yes it does."

I know I've just broken Darryn's cardinal rule of taking things out of context, but given that Darryn keeps saying I missed that it's all about semantics, that's slightly ironic. How can anyone confuse the meaning of what the pundits say when they talk about multitasking. Darryn knows quite well what they refer to, but in no way does he want to respond to them.

So here's my question to darryn. And I'm only going to allow a Yes or No answer....

In the context of articles relating to the iPad being able to run multiple applications of a users choosing at once, are the "pundits" correct in saying it's not possible? Yes or No.

See, Darryn's article was all on why the tech pundits were WRONG. Not why they were misguided. Not why they were making silly comments, but WRONG. Not expressing an opinion that was wrong, just that they had got it WRONG.

A really good example of this is Darryn's response to my comments re the podcast...

"Also, Phil needs to re-listen to the podcast when he asks about Skype (22 minutes in) because I actually explain why running Skype in the background is not needed before asking why you'd want to run a chat application in the background at which point I try to explain about the limitations of the iPhone. "

Limitations? What sort of limitation Darryn? Dare I ask...but do you mean a limitation that stops me running applications in the background? Heck...I think you do! Wait...that means you're

The all singing, all dancing, h-yprocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

saying that...wait for it...it can't multitask !!?? Or maybe you're just saying that multitasking would be really poor. The limitation is the performance if multitasking (in the way the pundits are talking about) were allowed?

By this point you seem to be saying:

- Yes, you can multitask
- Steve Jobs think it's a bad idea (but can you or can't you?)
- You agree (he'll be pleased to know that)
- Why would you want to any way (but can you or can't you?)
- The limitations of the hardware don't let you multitask (which contradicts the first) or would cause issues...which leads us back to it being an issue. Odd that it is an issue, if, as you stated, " *yes it does*", but then Steve Jobs thinks it's a bad idea. It's not like Steve to do things that are a bad idea!

My entire point of my post was that your attack on the pundits wasn't criticism of *their* opinion. It was criticism of their facts, and their facts (in their context) were right. But you selectively ignored their comment and decided to open with a direct "They're wrong" approach. You state they get it wrong, but then try and argue an opinion. It's the equivalent of saying "

The pundits claim that $2 + 5$ doesn't equal 6

" and counter the argument with "

Heck, why would you want to add those two numbers together anyway

". Here's another good example...

"When I had a go at the tech pundits for saying the iPhone was not capable of multitasking I did so to prove that while it can't run multiple apps it can multitask "

Newsflash. Your opinion of what multitasking is, is different to what the pundits are describing. They're not wrong. You're not either. Their OPINION differs. They are talking about multitasking differently...but in your eyes, they're wrong.

Dancing

The all singing, all dancing, h-y-pocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

Darryn states...

"This one blew me away with how humorously ridiculous Phil was being. All I could picture when reading this section was Phil skipping around on tip toes singing in a high pitched voice "Of course there's a phone and there's also a magical kingdom of elves made out of jellybeans".

Phil's incessant stripping of context from my posts makes his ramblings about me trying to equate attaching a camera as being the same as actually having a camera meaningless because he's missed the point entirely... and if he is skipping about singing he may just have missed the boat as well. ;-)"

I think I'm meant to be insulted by that one, but I'm just mostly confused. I know sarcasm is the lowest form of wit, but I'm failing to figure out whether it's sarcasm or wit. It's very hard to tell.

So let's try and take this a bit further....some more context (ie, a longer piece of text) from Darryn's first post (and keep in mind, in the podcast Darryn claimed "Yes it does" when we commented on the iPad not having a camera)....

"The iPad lacks a camera: Actually it does. In fact the iPad has a camera that is far superior to any built-in one ."

We get the point Darryn, but my argument was that it doesn't have a camera. It doesn't even have an external one. If that was the case, it would be billed as such. It would have made a far better read if you had written...

"The iPad lacks a camera. It doesn't need a camera! The iPad will have access to cameras that will be far superior to any built-in one, because you can attach any camera you want "

The all singing, all dancing, h-yocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

See how that makes far better sense than saying the pundits got it wrong when they said it doesn't have a camera? Saying it does was just nonsensical.

And the jellybean eating elves think so too!

Flash

"First things first people Phil has a vested interest in all things Adobe"

Well I could either be exceptionally insulted by the insinuation, or laugh it off. I'm going to do the latter...to some extent.

Vested interest? Hmm, financial one? Well, no...I have no pecuniary (I've always wanted to use that word!) interest in Adobe. I do in Apple...I own shares...two!

Vested interest in their apps? Well I've used some of their apps for years as they are the default standard for things like graphics and web editing. I guess I've then got a vested interest in every other software app I use from every other software company (I'll say more on this in a moment). Vested interests in Apple, FileMaker, etc etc

Vested interest? In that my University has invested a lot of money on an exceptionally useful Flash-based web-conferencing system? Well in that case, yes.

Vested interest in that I'm an Adobe Higher Education Leader? Well that's paradoxical. Why did I get appointed an AEL? Because of the exceptional use of the Adobe Connect system within our University...so of course, I wouldn't be an AEL if not for how we are using their product. And speaking of being an AEL, I do get all their software for free as an AEL. I make no bones about that...but it's not a vested interest at all. The software I use now is the software out of that bundle I have always used and that the University has paid for (I've got nothing on my laptop

The all singing, all dancing, h-ypocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

that I didn't have before becoming and AEL). There's a lot that I don't use or haven't had the time to try (such as Adobe Premiere, which I'm dying to get time to try). So I'm not entirely sure just what being vested in Adobe actually means?

Phil doesn't understand

Darryn concludes by suggesting that I don't "*understand how computers are being used outside universities.*" "Hilarious...and slightly offensive."

Let's keep in mind that Darryn's challenge was to find one instance of where Flash was useful....and I quote..."*In fact I challenge you to give me one example where Flash is so absolutely vital that the task can't be done some other way.*"

Darryn then suggests I'm a hypocrite (but appears to ingeniously spell it in such a way as to confuse people...sneaky) and then somehow starts talking about intranets for some reason. Let's take a look at what he says and see if you can spot where he has cleverly disguised calling me a hypocrite. Look closely...it's hidden really well...

"What's even more with Phil's arguments he lambasted me for stating opinion as fact and yet when it comes to Flash he's fine with doing it himself. There is a word in the English language for that it starts with "H" and ends with "ypocrit". He tries to make it out that it's fact the iPhone doesn't give you a full INTERNET experience because HE can't access his university's conferencing system from his iPhone. I'm sorry but Phil seems to be unaware that an internal INTRANET is not an Internet experience. I also fail to see how you not being able to access something that no one else on the Internet has access to fits in with the context of my post which was being aimed at the general Internet use of Flash."

So this is where it's clear Darryn hasn't read a thing. I never mentioned intranets. I mentioned the internet, I mentioned lots of websites that I visit a great deal, and I mentioned our students...50% of whom study off campus (approx 20K of them or thereabouts). Heck I even referenced the fact that we'd surveyed the students and the response had been stunning.

The all singing, all dancing, h-ypocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

Darryn suggests that because I can't access things I like to look at and use....and then (how dare I) state that you can't use the Internet on the iPhone, that I'm simply thinking about me, and everyone doesn't think this is the case.

Umm, but they do think the same way sorry Darryn, it's not just me.

The entire UK appear to agree with this as their advertising authority banned an advert from Apple suggesting that the "Internet" was available on the iPhone because it was considered misleading...

<http://arstechnica.com/apple/news/2008/08/misleading-internet-claims-lead-to-ban-of-iphone-a-d-in-uk.ars>

"A British advertising group has deemed the claims made in one iPhone commercial "misleading" and says that it can no longer be aired in the UK. The misleading part is not about the new iPhone being blazingly fast or anything like that, but the fact that "all the parts of the Internet are on the iPhone." Because the iPhone is unable to play Flash files or support Java, the Advertising Standards Authority says, it doesn't actually support all parts of the Internet. "

So Darryn thinks it is just me. The UK's ASA wouldn't agree. Darryn of course, is ...starts with a "w" and ends in "rong" here (See what I did there? Tricky!), but he's likely just to suggest that both me and the ASA are now wrong. Oh, and all those other blog writers, journalists and "pundits" who wrote about this at the time.

Next Darryn suggests that these ivory towers (actually a fairly grotty social science tower) that I sit in, blinds me from the outside world. That we at this University may need Flash, but who else does.

Remember...Darryn's challenge is about finding one instance where Flash is needed. My answer to him.....well, I'm not going to talk about Flash...I'm going to keep talking about just ONE Flash based application. Just one.

The all singing, all dancing, h-y-pocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

But...gosh...dilemma. If only I could think of an example outside these hallowed walls?

OK...is the US Department of Defense deemed to be outside of this University and big enough?...

<http://www.adobe.com/aboutadobe/pressroom/pressreleases/200706/062707DoD.html>

No? How about the U.S. Marine Corps? Are they outside the University?

<http://www.adobe.com/aboutadobe/pressroom/pressreleases/200908/U.S.MarineCorpsSelectsAdobeAcrobatConnectPro.html>

I'm not going to re-hash what is already a justifiable use of Flash...but I will restate, that I would kill to have a Flash enabled iPad with a forward facing camera, to use with Connect.

When you say "He" Darryn, I say "We".

When you say "INTRANET", I say "INTERNET"...something you truly can't get, in all its glory on the iPhone or iPad

When you say "*I also fail to see how you not being able to access something that no one else on the Internet has access to*" , I just feel that you continue to not appreciate the needs of others. You haven't read and haven't understood what this system is and what it is used for...in study, in business, in defence and in government. This isn't about you or me Darryn...it's about a hell of a lot of people, pundits included, that make use of Flash...and they want it on the iPad. If they didn't, why the uproar?

And I'm done. Signing off now. Suddenly I have a craving for jellybeans!?

The all singing, all dancing, h-ypocritical Phil

Written by Philip Roy

Tuesday, 16 February 2010 12:44 - Last Updated Wednesday, 17 February 2010 13:00

Update - Fixed some spelling mistakes and a hurried maths example