

Re: JSH: Just plain silly

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-09/4521.html>

From: Denis Feldmann (denis.feldmann_at_wanadoo.fr)

Date: 09/19/04

Date: Sun, 19 Sep 2004 23:38:37 +0200

Quinn Tyler Jackson wrote:

> *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.*

sci.math: Re: JSH: Just plain silly

>

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

>

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

James **is** a special case indeed. Revisionist history is still a big word for what happened. Anyway, a lot of people were quite unhappy with what happened, but not for James, only because it prevented readers to see why the paper should have been rejected...

>

> *If so -- enlighten me, please.*