

Roy Sedge on science for the Study Group:-

Hi Gordy:

As an aside, I have a real reaction to the comments concerning the inclusion or exclusion of science in the study group. Up front I think that putting limits on how "scientific" a discussion can be could result in a potential disaster for the study group. We come from different backgrounds and whatever it is all of us sift through a great deal of information that may or may not be practical to us. I'm sure that the physicists in the group may not be as interested in discussions in teaching casting to a group of children with Asperger's as the rehab guys learning a little physics. All of us have different filters.

In addition, there appears to be more than just a few folks studying for the MCI who want just the pertinent information (what is pertinent and what is not?) and nothing more. While recognizing that fly casting is generally considered an art, it is one with a science base. One cannot hope to effectively teach without some knowledge coming from a rather varied collection of disciplines. As one of many examples, I often think of the relationship of line speed generated by translation vs. rotation vs. hauling and the practicality of this type of science (which is rather fascinating). If these relationships are understood, it becomes a practical matter why we teach that in order to increase line speed we do not work on speeding up the casting stroke but work on turn-over and hauling to generate line speed. My observation is that there are still instructors and certainly a good number of casters who still work on speeding up the casting stroke as the primary vehicle for increasing the line speed! A little science might change the way they teach.

My hope is that the undue criticism for including the science of casting in the discussion group does not create more work for you! To my way of thinking, one of the major tasks for the student (we are all students aren't we?) is to be able to separate information categories can be useful. If is unable to do so, the journey is just a little longer. I have a behavioral science background including research design. My math and physical science background is limited and I do not pretend to understand all of the discussions.

However, wading through the subject matter and reading the dialog generally allows me to pick out golden nuggets of relevant information to reshape some particular concept. How boring a discipline would be if there was not a body of people always re defining it!

Too many folks need pertinent information handed to them on a golden spoon. It seems to me that a large part of the journey is for each of us, with varying background to learn how to sift through volumes of information to find relevant answers.

Just my thoughts,

All the best,

Roy