

reg Kramer's "Cerebrealty" article on flaming was truly outstanding. He expressed exactly what I've been feeling for the last several months. Like Greg Kramer, I've learned not to react to online rants, and have even stopped myself from posting what, in a more civilized world, would have been a completely called-for rebuttal. It's just not worth it.

If I may, I'd like to propose an additional theory. I think that most Internet users are inclined to misunderstand a message because they scan text instead of reading it carefully in order to save on connection charges. I have no statistics to prove it, but I suspect that the majority of AOL members and the like have not been initiated into the joys of reading and composing messages offline. Consequently, as Greg Kramer stated, possessing writing skills does not guarantee that you will be understood; I'd go as far as to say that a well-crafted message is more likely to be misinterpreted, because a quick scan of it would not bring out the little nuances and witticisms (which would probably be beyond some of these people anyway).

Kramer's article ought to be included in newsgroup FAQs as required reading. Unfortunately, I don't think anyone reads those things. Besides, even if they did, they'd most likely take offense and flame him again!

Raul Regalado, via America Online

Wow. What a great commentary. Greg Kramer hits on this topic with such rationality and common sense. I couldn't agree more with what was written, and his story worries me about the future of society on the 'Net, because for some reason, everybody likes to flame. It is ridiculous, and yet it continues daily. Thanks for the informative article. I will pass around a copy for others to read...

Ken Schwartzreich, via the Internet

I've just seen your publication for the first time. Wow! You've really done a wonderful job, not only with the content, but also with the online aspects.

I have a question: the biggest problem in Web design right now seems to be how to optimize text in online graphics. The text in your graphics is very sharp, and I was wondering if you use any particular techniques to go about optimizing it. I'm sure the entire Web community would be very interested in this. I've seen a number of sites that deal with low-memory graphics and cross-platform designing, but I have yet to find a site that discusses optimal text graphics.

Well, thanks again, and I'll be sure to include your publication on my home page hotlist. Keep up the great work!

John Cady, via the Internet

Thanks for your compliments! To make our online text, we use Adobe Photoshop's text tool, with anti aliasing. Anti-aliasing smooths the edges of the text, approximating colors and giving the text a "blurred" look which removes jagged edges. This, however, is not enough to get "optimized" text. You really have to search, through trial and error, for a font that reads well at a small size with anti aliasing. Not all do. Times Roman at a small size and anti-aliasing will be very hard to read. You're better off with bolder, san-serif fonts that have a heavy weight—but whose internal spaces (i.e., the inside of an "o") remain well defined. — ED.

Thanks for a great product/service! I have been reading the online mag for the past year or so, and it keeps getting better. I am a subscriber to the CD-ROM version, and it is by far the best mag I have read (paper, electronic, or other!).

Your innovations in bringing current Mac topics to the masses are creative and fun for the readers, and your shareware library (on the CD) is indispensable. It saves many hours of hunting and downloading OS updates, etc.

Thanks again, I look forward to the next issue!

Tom Morrissey, via the Internet

e'd like to hear from you. If you'd like to comment on anything you've read in MacSense, please send us email at [MacSenseED@aol.com](mailto:MacSenseED@aol.com). We reserve the right to edit letters for length and clarity.