

## Re: Copying string to byte array

**Source:** <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/VB/microsoft.public.vb.general.discussion/2005-01/1628.html>

---

**From:** Jim Mack ([jmack\\_at\\_mdxi.nospam.com](mailto:jmack_at_mdxi.nospam.com))

**Date:** 01/14/05

Date: Fri, 14 Jan 2005 07:33:26 -0500

Sam Hobbs wrote:

> *"Jim Mack" wrote ...*

>>

>> *I don't get where this apparent anger is coming from.*

>

> *I am sorry that it appears to be anger; it is frustration, and there*

> *is a difference between anger and frustration.*

Not so much in dry print, I fear.

> *I am frustrated*

> *because this type of thing happens too much; that people are quick to*

> *respond to whatever they think they should respond to, without*

> *responding to the question that is asked.*

This is true, and irrelevant. Answers to the original question are the ones attached to that question. Responses to responses to responses should be seen as something else, no? And people always respond to what they think they should. Doing otherwise is a version of insanity.

> *The problem is that since*

> *they don't respond to the question that was asked, they respond to*

> *something that is vague. Therefore their response is a response to an*

> *incomplete question or whatever. And then I have to explain that the*

> *response is not what I was asking for, and then the other people*

> *criticize me for not appreciating their help.*

This may be the crux of our difference. You seem to think that asking a question makes you the owner of everything that follows. You have to "explain" to people that they said something that didn't answer your question. Why? This is the nature of usenet, that threads drift and diverge. Understanding may emerge, or fade away. But if you think that everything posted in a thread should be an answer to the original question, I see where that could be frustrating, because it rarely happens.

I, on the other hand, think that if someone wanted to answer your original question they would have done so directly. That I didn't should

be a clue that what I posted wasn't intended as such. It was an attempt to point out a possible misapprehension on your part which could have an impact on the way that you approach the problem.

>> *Your posts fairly*  
>> *seethe, and as far as I can tell I've done nothing except try to*  
>> *help -- well, with a little sarcasm thrown in the last post, but I*  
>> *rule that justifiable based on your tone.*  
>  
> *That is ridiculous. Obviously you will simply escalate the*  
> *foolishness if we continue.*

Not so -- take a poll on ridiculousness here. You're obviously smart and have a lot of experience in other areas. You may even have a sense of humor. We'd probably get along pretty well in person, or in a thread where your frustration level was a little lower.

>> *I didn't respond to your original post*  
>  
> *Exactly. You did not spend the time necessary to do that; you just*  
> *responded to the middle portion.*

Excuse me -- where did we sign on as your personal answer-monkeys? We're all in this together, and none of us has an obligation to spend our time the way another thinks we should. I'll respond how I want, when I want, and hope that those responded to have the intelligence, perspicacity, and breadth of sight to see, or to discover, the relevance to the thread.

I'll say again what I've said twice before -- if you don't like my advice, or think you know better, just ignore it. Time will tell, indeed has already told, whether the advice is correct, but only you can decide if it's relevant.

--

Jim