



O T &lt;oyvind.thomassen@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Re:**

1 message

---

**Pasquale Schiraldi** <p.schiraldi@lse.ac.uk>

7 November 2015 at 01:20

To: Oyvind Thomassen &lt;oyvind.thomassen@gmail.com&gt;

Cc: Stephan Seiler &lt;sseiler@stanford.edu&gt;, Howard Smith &lt;howard.smith@economics.ox.ac.uk&gt;

Oyvind,

I am not sure about what trust you are referring to. And it is not even clear why and about what you have been generous. This is not about generosity is about fairness.

I mentioned in the email to Howard that a reverse order might jeopardize the possibility to use the paper for my carrier (I am also sure this is the same for Stephan and Howard) as well, nevertheless I agreed that I am still willing to write a letter to your head of department to help you out. So I did not refused to reach an agreement, I have just proposed one that feels better.

Let me be clear about what is going to happen. I have already informally discussed this with my senior colleagues and an editor of a major journal, I am going to write a letter to the editors of the main journals to make them aware of the situation. After this letter, the papers will not be published and in the best scenario the editor in charge will require us to merge or reach an agreement after communicating the whole situation to our head of departments at that point our bargaining position will be very different. At very best this whole process will delay the publication of the papers for years and there is a likely scenario where nothing will be published. As for my point of view having no publication or a minor one it does not make any difference and therefore I will go ahead in writing this letter because I must and will safeguard my own interest at that point.

If you think this is a better outcome for you than reaching now an agreement I cannot force you otherwise then the only thing left for me to do is to go ahead with this alternative way.

Best

Pasquale

On Fri, Nov 6, 2015 at 3:22 PM, Oyvind Thomassen <oyvind.thomassen@gmail.com> wrote:

I have seen the email from Pasquale to Howard where, in response to my offer it says, among other similar statements: "However, what he [Oyvind] is proposing is too unfair for me to accept."

Given that my offer has been declined by Pasquale, the offer is no longer standing. If there were any doubt, it is hereby revoked by me.

I believe my offer was generous, and went far beyond what was warranted by the facts.

Even a detailed agreement like the one I proposed is no stronger than the integrity of the people who have agreed to it. Pasquale's last email revealed that he is not sufficiently reasonable to warrant the kind of trust an agreement with him would entail.

For this reason, I do not wish to engage in any further discussion of this issue.

I regret to conclude that it was not possible for us to reach an agreement.

Best wishes,

Oyvind Thomassen, Seoul 6 November 2015

--

Department of Economics  
32 Lincoln's Inn Fields, Room 4.22  
London School of Economics  
Houghton Street  
London WC2A 2AE  
t: 020-7955-7584  
web: <http://personal.lse.ac.uk/SCHIRALD/>