

"Youtube is indeed a tough place to continue this, but in the interest of keeping it open and not relying on other sites,"

Agreed. The main reason I want to keep it here is because this is where the theory and method are published and I would have preferred DM, but the manner and tone and then subsequent strawman argumentation, required me to defend here and thoroughly.

"I'll attempt to condense the wall of text i just read and clarify the points you want to make:"

The wall of text was warranted given that I want anyone who read your arguments to be apprised of what I see to be fair, unfair, valid, and-or flawed. So I wanted to be fair and thorough defending my theory and YT channel's reputation.

"Seeing as how an honest attempt at being polite made me ended up coming off like an arrogant and insufferable asshole (because we miss the tone of voice so much in text), lets just get to brass tacks and speak plainly."

Fair enough.

"I'm sure you'll still think I'm an asshole either way."

No, I don't. Why would I say I like you if I thought you were an asshole in general? To the contrary, I think you are a good person. I just think that in this case, rather than exploring the method/theory in a cooperative manner as equals in BMS fandom, you were attempting to show your superiority. You may have just been jumping on a bandwagon that occurred elsewhere? I don't know, but the arrogance was thick considering you don't seem even willing to test it.

"As per your first 'reminder' of how you are a better pilot than I, thats probably true - Im not that great a pilot."

Strawman. I never said I was a better pilot. I had one bombing run using 5544 with you that turned out better and tried to remind you that IIRC I was working on 5544 mid to high altitude lofts working up towards that mission. I was simply drawing to your attention the fact that 5544 method has been successfully deployed in a high threat environment (other planes not hitting target and-or not surviving) and to remind you that you were present.

I didn't think I was a better pilot, I was thinking maybe I had a better method given the threats and the marshalled package. Moreover, I would have no basis to think that I was a better pilot given we haven't flown together for 3 years +. Additionally, I think you are flying Xplane11 presently (which I think I'm gonna get here soon) and I suspect that gives you further advantage overall. As to 5544 lofting, yes, I am sure I know this one minor aspect of BMS simming than you, because I use it in campaigns when I think it's the best option I have.

"That's because I prefer to let the systems do the work, and that helps me worry about my SA."

That's a good point. And maybe that's why I did not suggest in the video that 5544 was the best way of attacking the target.

"perhaps that's another reason why I'm not a fan of something that by your own admission 'looks cool'."

It's fun. I'm not apologizing for that. I never said I would do it when other options were clearly the better choice.

"Because I'm far more interested in accomplishing the objective than looking cool doing it."

As am I.

"I find enjoyment in working with other pilots, and getting warheads on foreheads, not flying a complex and (I still believe) unnecessarily risky maneuver."

Fine, but again you are mainly arguing against lofting, not so much 5544's version of it.

"If I'm going to loft, I'm going to follow the cues I'm given - which work regardless of Airspeed or Altitude. Now, let's look at the manuals..."

The manual specifies that a Loft should be performed with a 4G climb. This is per Pg.90 of the BMS Training manual (4.34, v1.2) - which also suggests a speed of 550knots and 4.5-5.6nm as the devs admit the cues are 'a bit off'. Sound familiar?"

Yes, it sounds familiar. With respect to 550 knots, that's within 500 give or take 50. But you will notice that is a recent change. So, unless I am lying about the Aardvark loft 3 years ago, I demonstrated this before Red Dog updated his manual, so you may want to ask him where he stole that from [sarcasm]. I didn't see any credit given there. At any rate, it's actually not plagiarizing because the ideas are so different. He's saying 550 (why I don't know), I'm saying 450 to 550 based on my tests.

As to 4g he describes it quite different than I do. He states 4g climb. I don't call it that. I'll say something like pull a constant 4g Immelman, which means you are flying a loop rather than a linear climb. So again, quite different.

"This is the crux of my point; you've 'discovered' a methodology already specified in the manual, and added on an Immelman to it, which you then conceded to be potentially unnecessary."

If I said 'discover' I didn't mean that I worked it without reference to anything. That's quite an uncharitable way to treat me. I meant that I've worked out this 5544 mnemonic and method to

-- where if you follow it -- I think you'll get the bombs to come off when I've seen so many profess to having problems with it even after consulting the manual. It doesn't mean that I didn't have some data points to start my testing.

"I wanted to see at what point you'd have offered any citations for your work, but its not been forthcoming, so I'll assume you either are unfamiliar with the manual or you are being dishonest. I'd honestly prefer to believe it was the former."

Oh, shall we go through the claims that you have made without citing the manual? You said such and such about CCRP. Where did you get CCRP from? Is your claims regarding CCRP, in part, due to your knowledge gained from reading the manuals at one point? If not, why didn't you cite the manual? Are you trying to take credit for an idea that wasn't originally yours?

Yeah, you went low there. Again, you act is if you are morally superior to me and yet you have no trouble in presenting an argument in a very similar fashion? My friend, the 5544 theory and method is not an academic paper. I know how to do those (with MLA citation being my preferred format) but this was just supposed to be friendly food for thought I published for fellow simmers here (where I likely originally perceived the manual to be somewhat lacking).

"Im not arguing against 5544 - its the recommended speed and usage for the correct sight cues according to the manual after all."

Well, 5544 is quite different on many points. I say you can go as low as 450 knots. Manual doesn't say that. I say you wait for 4 seconds after the loft cue flashing stops. Manual doesn't say that. I infer that you need to be pulling a loop, manual really doesn't lead you to that conclusion.

"Im arging that Lofiting in general is a very limited use case and that often other more tacitally flexible options are available."

Thank you. So quit dictating to me to "please refine your methodology to a more tactically sound framework." And just make a comment as to why lofting is usually not the best answer.

"You say you have proposed a method, then get very annoyed or upset that someone is taking the time to offer improvement."

No, I do not get upset when a person offers improvement. That's wrong. IIRC you have not offered anything beyond the slice to help improve it. (By the way, you came up with that AFTER someone else came up with that so are you plagiarizing there?) I'm not annoyed with suggestions and discussing why a slice is most often the better option. I am annoyed when you won't admit that an Immelmann may be better in some situations. Even so, that's not my complaint with you.

"Your continued insistence that i am calling you stupid or that i am somehow 'god-like' is unwarranted - and is more indicative of your inability to accept critique"

I am perfectly capable of accepting critique. Go back and read the numerous times I have acknowledged shortcomings due to your feedback. Please take back this slanderous statement.

“and assume that of course, I must be just a mean and spiteful individual with nothing better to do.”

Again, I have not suggested that you are mean or spiteful IIRC. I am complaining about your unwarranted certitude and strawman arguments in an effort to raise yourself up and put me down. I think you are failing to check your ego as you make your arguments -- several of which have been quite inciteful.

“I trust the time we did spend flying together would remind you that at all times I fly others i am respectful and polite,”

I agree 100% there! I have always found you to be respectful and polite in cockpit. I would add that in the forums, discord, DMs, etc. you are mostly respectful and polite there as well. Where I think you have a shortcoming -- sometimes -- is when you are trying to make an argument, and you end up injecting your ego in there a bit too much. (By pointing this out about you, I am not saying that I don't fall into the very same trap.)

“so these assertions that I am calling you stupid or that I am somehow superior to you are particularly hurtful.”

Well, then please consider how you would feel if I came over to your YT channel and told you that you needed to refine your Xplane11 ideas about when to start a sideslip in a crosswind landing when you are within 5 knots of your max crosswind component, when my real complaint is that you should simply divert if you are within 5 knots of your max crosswind component. Therefore, the advice in your video should never be followed and is not fit for purpose.

“I have attempted to be as tactful as possible and respectful in our discourse here;”

I appreciate the attempt.

“any tone you read into that implies im condesending or calling you stupid is on you”

Wrong. The speaker whose chosen words objectively infers the other is stupid, lazy, mean and-or an idea thief, that's on the writer. Know your audience is a maxim of writing that you will be hard pressed to show to be unsound.

“that you accuse me of strawmanning is hilarious given that you are getting borderline ad hominem”

So, you deny making strawman arguments? No, I suspect you won't go there because the record is pretty clear. Instead of honestly and forthrightly addressing whether or not you strawmanned me, you avoid it and call into question my character.

For what it's worth, I agree with you that some of my responses come across as ad hominem, because quite simply I am not annoyed with you bringing up points that concern 5544 or even lofting in general. I'm annoyed with the hubris demonstrated and you conflating your apparent disapproval of lofting as if lofting was my idea.

"with these accusations while (ill choose to believe accidentally) committing plagiarism by asking the community to evaluate your 'discovery' which can be obtained by reading included in-game pdf's."

Bullcrap. That's slanderous right there. I have not engaged in plagiarism. You might want to look up some articles on and classic cases regarding plagiarism. I have a little bit of experience with regard to this subject as I was elected to the honor court of my law school for 3 years in a row and we handled a few plagiarism cases. If you want a debate on whether or not I engaged in plagiarism I'd be willing to defend my name in that regard right here in the comments section.

"You concede a few points regarding the idea of Immelmanning in favour of a low slice, that smart weapons are a better call"

I concede that and a lot more. I.E. points you make on pilot workload, energy, and threats in the target while at the same time questioning your idea which seems to be that the Immelmann could never be the better option, and that lofting from altitude never could never being the better bomb delivery option, etc.

"apologies, i missed your one word conecssion of 'Yes'),

"but then argue you can loft an LGB/JDAM. I sincerely hope you dont intend to self-designate an LGB while in an Immelmann, because while i have never tested as such i suspect the TGP would struggle to keep up."

Good catch. Yeah I would not recommend an Immelmann as to solo LGB deliveries. JDAM, however, should work just fine solo.

"you're quite right i myself havent conceded any points yet, but thats because this is YOUR theory. its your role to defend and refine it."

Well, yes and no. I have chosen to defend it to the extent it is defensible and no further. If I am not convinced it needs refining, then I will most likely not assume such a role. Yet, IIRC I invited people to refine it for themselves in the video or in the forums.

We, if we wish to work in the cooperative spirit professed, should feel obligated to concede points when we realize the point being made by the other person is a valid one. This is

regardless of whether we are the one presenting a theory or discussing the theory in a cooperative and charitable spirit. In other words, you don't prove the claim you are being a helpful and amicable spirit if you continue to argue points without making concessions when you have the opportunity to do so.

"However, ill list a few retractions given your rebuttal. I regret DTOS was even mentioned. I clearly havent used it in a while and i should have just skipped straight into CCIP/CCRP. It only served to muddy the waters. Apologies."

I thank you for your apology on that point, though I don't think it is necessary where you brought up something that has nothing to do with 5544. That's not the issue per se that I am cross about. The issue that I am cross about is you trying to make yourself look smart and therefore make me look stupid by making a strawman argument and then attempting to handily take the strawman to task.

"I did indeed miss the forum post you refer to where you admit that slicing is indeed a suggested improvement; i dont visit the BMS forums much these days, i have too many other balls to juggle. Apologies once again, i merely saw fit to comment on what i saw here."

Again, I thank you for the apology, but it is not needed. I do not expect you to research what I have said about this topic within the YT comment section let alone other venues. I brought that up to demonstrate to you that I have shown myself to be open to criticism and refining my thoughts on the subject. And that I am trying to distinguish to you that it's not your criticisms that are unwelcome, rather it is the tone by which they are delivered.

"I will also concede, now that you have pointed this out, that flying straight and level would not be better than any kind of evasive maneuver, and also im glad you wouldnt attempt such a maneuver without having a fairly clear air picture in the first place."

Thank you. I appreciate it.

"To sum up, 5544 absolutely has a place in the tactics book - after all, its already in the manual."

Bullcrap. It's not in the manual. Something akin to it is, some of the datapoints are, but what I have here is clearly quite different. Whether 4Gs came to me before I read the 4.33 manual or not I couldn't say. I suspect I read it from there or got that starting point second hand somewhere, maybe in the BMS or UO forums or discord. I don't remember. Likewise, the idea of 500 knots plus or minus 50 may have started with some mention of 550 knots I read in a forum or somewhere else in the 4.33 manuals, but I flew hundreds of missions to figure out the minimum and max and that the way to get the reliable release (at least for me) was the continuous holding of the 4Gs until all bombs were released.

"What i disagree with is your egress and your initial inability to accept critique to the egress method without passing it off as me just being mean."

Bullcrap. I accept the bulk of your critique of the Immelmann as to the egress, to suggest otherwise is patently unfair. I simply countered to you were right but the slice may not always be the better choice. Please reread. I have no problems with your criticism regarding a slice being a better option in many if not most situations. What I have a problem with was the condescending tone you sprinkled around a bit within your critique.

"This isnt about an ego thing;"

Oh yes it is. Which I can admit on my part, but you seem unable to admit on yours.

"this is about you plagiarising existing work and adding what"

Bullcrap. That's just something you came up with as an *ad hominem* attack on me once you realized that you had been strawmanning me over and over again. You implied no such thing in your original and two follow up posts. Only now have you brought it up to discredit me and my work. I put a lot of effort into testing the method and making the video.

"i consider to be faulty advice about the egress method."

Fair enough, as I have conceded several times.

"We can agree to disagree there, as we simply have different ideas of what we consider to be the more serious threats."

Again, that's reasonable and in no way condescending. This I very much find to be fair and respectful. However, I am disappointed in that you cannot conceive of a situation where an Immelmann would favor the pilot.

"You are indeed an expericenced pilot;"

Thank you. But, as to BMS, only in some very narrow areas that I have tested extensively. Overall, I am weak in sims and in real flying.

"but if you want to present theories or advice, you have a long way to go accepting feedback and critique."

Bullcrap. I don't have to sit here like some simpleton and let pompous attitudes migrate over from God knows where to my YT channel and condescend to me. Please show me where I haven't given due consideration to any of your feedback and critique that involves my 5544 method and theory?

The things that I do not accept are things that are suspect. Such as that in all circumstances the slice is the better egress and inferences of that nature. Which I don't mind discussing with you. The only thing I object to is people having the gall to call my ideas stupid or stolen and then pretend they aren't inferring that I am stupid or a charlatan.

"Thanks for reading."

My pleasure and best wishes to you.