

# Re: The Chronicles of Bob Ling's bumbLINGS

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2006-09/msg00518.html>

---

- *From:* [Russell.Martin@xxxxxxx](mailto:Russell.Martin@xxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 11 Sep 2006 10:03:58 -0700
- 

Nag wrote:

Russell,

I have no problem with your first post but your second post puzzles me.

If you had no trouble with my first post, why did you comment on it?

You were commenting about my post and not vice versa.

In my second post I was commenting on your comment on my first post.

Hence you, not I,  
should have done some work and gathered data

I had. I've read RF's posts. Why did you "presume" I hadn't?

(about my interaction with  
Bob Ling) before jumping in with words like "gratuitous".

I didn't "jump". IMO it was gratuitous.

Why should I  
care about your past with Bob Ling?

Because you presumed, falsely, that I "haven't seen Bob

Re: The Chronicles of Bob Ling's bumbLINGS

Ling's choice of words". I have seen many of them and I was suggesting you had had the opportunity to avoid making that mistake, which you did not take advantage of.

Am I supposed to dig into the "history" of every one who responds to my post?

If you want to make comments about things without falsely "presuming", then yes.

Are you saying the only way to respond to Bob Ling is "your" way and no other way? And you will agree only if I follow your way?

No, I just expressed my opinion about your way. Are you saying I have no right to do that?

About being "off topic", I am indeed guilty. But that is a consequence of an unmoderated group (I support a moderated group) and an irresponsible poster and my choice of how to deal with him.

Best  
Nag

Sure. And your choice is to add to the noise instead of coming straight to the point and just telling RF you don't think his approach is helpful to the NG. Fine, I just wanted to point that out.

Cheers,  
Russell

.