

Dear Editor:

From: Michel LECOQ lecoq.michel@skynet.be

Subject: Review of *Joy of Inventing for Everyone* by Abram Teplitsky

I have read the review of the book from Dr Abram Teplitsky in the Triz-journal of June. My feeling is that some criticism is exaggerated. The book is maybe not perfect (some few errors) but it deserves a better review. I think also that the reader has to make some effort if he wants to get something from a book.

There is not a good and a bad way to teach. There are also many good ways to learn and up to now no psychologist, pedagogist or other "teaching expert" has found how people really learn. (See therefore Graham Rawlinson: he tells that "teaching and learning are almost orthogonal") For me teachers have optimized the teaching with little care for learning. Maybe we should open a discussion how to teach students inventing skills.

The book has obviously a smell of "translation" but for me I read the book with lot of interest and the best books about TRIZ that I read are all written by Russians (Altshuller himself, Shulyak, Savranski, Salamatov, Orloff etc...)

As I do not read Russian I have to accept the translation even if I can detect that it is a translation.

If Dr Teplitsky continues to publish that way, I will continue to read his books.

In a second letter, M. Lecoq added some more thoughts on translation:

About Frankfurt, Friedrich Schiller died in 1805 and 2005 is celebrated in Germany.

I noticed that Friedrich Schiller invented in 1788 the rules of Brainstorming. That looks exactly like the rules discovered by Osborne.

Here is a small translation exercise showing the point from my previous message

In a letter to his friend Theodor Koerner on December 1788 Schiller wrote: (about a question from his friend complaining that his creativity was low)

GERMAN ORIGINAL TEXT (language from 1788)

" Der Grund Deiner Klagen liegt, wie mir scheint, in dem Zwang, den Dein Verstand Deiner Imagination auflegte. Ich muß hier einen Gedanken hinwerfen und ihn durch ein Gleichniß versinnlichen. Es scheint nicht gut und dem Schöpfungswerke der Seele nachteilig zu sein, wenn der Verstand die zuströmenden Ideen, gleichsam an den Thoren schon zu scharf mustert. Eine Idee kann, isolirt betrachtet, sehr unbedeutend und sehr abenteuerlich

sein, aber vielleicht wird sie durch eine, die nach ihr kommt, wichtig; vielleicht kann sie in einer gewissen Verbindung mit diesen anderen angeschaut hat. Bei einem schöpferischen Kopfe hingegen, dächt mir, hat der Verstand seine Wache von den Thoren zurückgezogen, die Ideen stürzen pêle-mêle herein, und alsdann erst übersieht und mustert er den großen Haufen."

FRENCH TRANSLATION

La raison de votre plainte se trouve dans la contrainte que votre intelligence impose à votre imagination.

() manifestement, il n'est pas bon, car cela gêne le travail créateur de l'esprit, que l'intelligence examine de trop près les idées qui se présentent en foule, pour ainsi dire dès leur entrée.

Prise isolément une idée peut être tout à fait insignifiante ou même risquée à l'extrême; mais elle peut trouver son importance dans une idée qui la suit.

Il se peut qu'un rapprochement avec d'autres idées qui paraîtraient également absurdes, soit capable de nous fournir un maillon très utile;

ainsi, notre intelligence n'a pas le pouvoir de juger toutes ces idées avant qu'elle ait voulu les admettre toutes, et les examiner en corrélation avec nos autres idées.

Dans le cas de l'esprit créateur, l'intelligence a retiré ses gardiens des portes où les idées affluent pêle-mêle, pour ne procéder qu'ensuite à leur examen et à leur contrôle parmi l'ensemble.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION (that you could improve because it is your native language)

The reason of your complain is situated in the constrain that your intelligence puts upon your imagination.

() it is not good, because it hinders the creative work of the brain, that intelligence examines too carefully the ideas that arrive in large quantity, directly from the moment they appear.

Alone, an idea can be very insignificant, even extremely risky, but it can find its importance in an idea coming later.

It can happen, that put together with other ideas (seaming also absurd) they could provide a very useful link; so, our intelligence does not have the power to judge all these ideas before having them accepted all, and examines them in correlation with our other ideas.

For the creative brain, intelligence has taken its guards from the doors where the ideas flow pell mell, in order to proceed only later to their examination and their control amongst the whole.

Here is the site with letters from Schiller

www.wissen-im-netz.info/literatur/schiller/briefe/koerner/1788/134.htm