

Re: JSH: Just plain silly

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-09/4466.html>

From: Quinn Tyler Jackson (quinn-j_at_shaw.ca)

Date: 09/19/04

Date: Sun, 19 Sep 2004 18:15:31 GMT

Mensonator said:

> *So if it wasn't bugging you, why did you enlist your mentalist
> friends to defend*

Um, first off -- what the heck is a mentalist?

Second -- when I jumped in a few months back and spoke out about the SWJPAM nonsense, I did it of my own accord, and James actually suggested I *not* get involved.

I ended up getting royally roasted in public by an anonymous poster with no sense of human decency. And for what?

For stating that I'd seen something that was awry in the way a paper that had been accepted all of a sudden had magically been reviewed months before and rejected months before, with the editor allegedly sending this "review" to James that I'd seen posted here on sci.math AFTER publication, and which specifically spoke of the thing ALREADY having been published, but with that wording REMOVED from the "review" that was sent when the already published paper was yanked.

These things angered me. I spoke up. James didn't enlist me.

When I write something that gets published somewhere and someone doesn't necessarily agree with my take on things, they respond like this:

http://hirvi.cs.queensu.ca/boolean/boolean_LL.pdf

(See page two, first and second paragraph.)

That is how it's supposed to be done. In an honorable way.

That gives me a chance to formulate a response in the correct manner, and to seek publication of my response. My response to that author's comments are included in my latest paper. And so on.

That's how it's supposed to be done, isn't it?

Re: JSH: Just plain silly

sci.math: Re: JSH: Just plain silly

Am I wrong about this? Or is James Harris a special case that allows for revisionist history?

If so -- enlighten me, please.

--
Quinn