

From: KENNETH JUDD <kennethjudd@mac.com>
Date:10/31/2015 11:31 AM (GMT-06:00)
To: James Heckman <jheckman@uchicago.edu>
Subject: FYI

Jim,

1: Thomas, Yongyang and I are working on the responses to send you. They wanted to do this in a fast but sloppy manner. I am forcing them to do a careful and concise job. This is taking time because Thomas is teaching this semester and Yongyang has other obligations (due to Lars' decision to make Yongyang a slave of Ian Foster). I hope that you will have our response in early December.

2: I am now making public comments regarding JPE/Monika's treatment of the first Cai-Judd-Lontzek submission. I am NOT making any comments on the handling of the current submission. Keep this in mind if you hear of my comments about JPE.

An amusing item: Most people are appalled when I tell them of Monika's comment that JPE does not want papers written for smart people. [REDACTED. Unrelated to this matter.]

Ken

=====

On Oct 31, 2015, at 10:10 AM, James Heckman <jheckman@uchicago.edu> wrote:

[REDACTED: Unrelated to this matter.] on jpe please hold all fire Monika is pissed that I reopened your file harald is sensitive please just hold it in till we get this paper in and published plead with you to hold your fire these decisions are bundled I like your ability trump like to speak your mind but play Rubio for a while there is a time and a,okace for everyone

Sent via the Samsung GALAXY S® 5, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

=====

From: KENNETH JUDD [mailto:kennethjudd@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, November 02, 2015 1:18 AM
To: JJH Heckman
Subject: Re: FYI

Jim,

Last winter, I pleaded with you to proceed in a quick manner so that this paper could be accepted by now. In particular, a JPE paper is like winning the lottery for Lontzek in the European job market since none of his other papers are in a top journal. Instead, we waited until late August to hear from you, and now have to deal with six new referee reports, some very hostile. This means that Karl will have to support Lontzek for yet another year, sucking up money that he would like to use for other people.

You treated this as a new submission. You did not "reopen" the file. Also, they have no reason to complain because, as you told me, each editor has autonomy. You did not interfere with Monika's hatchet job; why should she interfere with your consideration?

You are the one that should be pissed at Monika for the crap she puts in JPE, even stuff that gives structural estimation a bad name. Do you care? No. She has autonomy.

It is easy for Trump to speak his mind because he has billions in the bank. I had to work hard to get computational economics projects included in the CIM-EARTH and RDCEP projects. I fought with Foster and Moyer about doing quality work and keeping the focus on scientific analysis free of political considerations. What happened? Foster kicked me out of RDCEP, and Lars used BFI to help Ian. Lars lied to me in order to get me to transfer control of some NSF funds away from NBER and to BFI so that I could do more fiscal policy work, but then went back on his promise of extra funds and also gave control of the money (and Yongyang's work tasks) to Foster and friends. They also killed many computational economics projects that I would have worked on.

Rubio got endorsed by a billionaire last week the same day that I became aware that one of my collaborators may lose his funding next summer. He has the resources to be patient. I don't.

Money is necessary for my computational economics agenda, but no one supports that agenda.

You help Fehr get 100 million Francs, but lied to Rosenbaum to avoid paying the 40K or so that it cost to have ICE07 in Hyde Park.

You rich people tell the rest of us to be patient. However, where are you when we play by your rules but get our money stolen, or have our papers savaged by editors and referees because we are not in the right "fight club"?

Time is running out on my academic career. Stanford is downgrading the status of Senior Fellows. Stanford people control Hoover money and make sure that it goes to Stanford people. If I find it useful to hammer Monika and the Stanford Economics department, then I will do so. If you want to take this paper, Yongyang and Thomas hostage, then so be it. I do not negotiate with terrorists. I have held back for two years on the RDCEP theft, fearful of what Ian and Lars would do to Yongyang's financing. I am patient but there is a limit.

I loved teaching at Chicago and the money was good, but in 2013 UC told me that teaching was the reason it was not going to give me access to the NSF funds I had earned. Combine that with the other attacks and you have to agree that it was UC that killed my teaching there.

There is no stock of good will to appeal to. The situation is simple and isolated. We submitted a paper. We are dealing with your requests. We trust that you will deal with our responses in an intellectually honest manner.

Ken

=====
 On Nov 2, 2015, at 6:14 AM, James J. Heckman <jheckman@uchicago.edu> wrote:

In light of the history of the paper I had to be cautious Its your call Ken Harald is following this paper closely and he could pull the plug if the old paper gets brought up again and Monika gets inflamed I see no gain from speaking your mind until its settled It may give you relief It may harm your coauthors I think the paper is good The best I could do is get a new submission If the file was reopened it would havemade Monika acting editor

=====

On Nov 2, 2015, at 9:14 AM, KENNETH JUDD <kennethjudd@mac.com> wrote:

Jim,

I now wish that we had just reopened he old file. It would not have mattered who the acting editor was because, as I told you, I would have brought the entire editorial board into this and this would be settled by now.

Thugs run JPE, and you don't care. Thanks for the info.

Ken

=====

From: KENNETH JUDD <kennethjudd@mac.com>

Subject: Re: FYI

Date: November 3, 2015 at 10:27:51 AM PST

To: JJH Heckman <jheckman@uchicago.edu>

Jim,

You see no gain because you aren't listening. I need research funding — now — and making legitimate criticisms of the status quo in economics could help, particularly when I go to sources other than academic economics.

I can also play this hostage game. Thomas and Yongyang are my students. Harald and Monika have students. It makes me sick to write this email but if that is the game we are playing, then so be it. The big difference is that my criticisms of anybody's work will be scientifically valid. They are threatening to abuse editorial power to silence discussion of legitimate issues.

Any harm they do to my students will be on your head.

Ken

=====

On Nov 3, 2015, at 9:16 PM, James J. Heckman <jheckman@uchicago.edu> wrote:

Ken

I spoke with Harald about your recent string of emails and threats to raise a stink about the handling of your paper in the first round at the JPE. We both agree that it will be exceptionally damaging to the handling of your paper at the journal. We have bent over backward out of deep respect for you. A previous editor Monika P rejected a very close draft. At my urging I convinced Harald to reopen the case against considerable precedent. In fact there is no precedent I know of

I continue to think your paper has great merit. But don't create a stink and make a delicate situation much much worse. Its so counterproductive. What rate of discount do you have to go off on these rants against people who respect you and want to encourage your work. Even if you are suicidal have you no concern about your coauthors?

A revised paper along the lines of my letter will very likely be published. If however you continue to rub old sores we will have to reconsider this decision. However angry you may be do not destroy a very delicate situation with a rant against Monika. Leave it alone or leave the JPE. Call me a son of a bitch, an idiot or whatever you like but let this act of respect for you and your work not be harmed and just do what you do best-wonderful economics

Jim

=====

From: KENNETH JUDD [mailto:kennethjudd@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 9:24 PM
To: JJH Heckman
Cc: Harald Uhlig
Subject: Re: Raising a Stink

Jim,

Three days ago you referred to this submission as "a new submission." You even said that "If the file was reopened it would have made Monika acting editor." I considered the experience with Monika a completed episode, and that she was out of the loop. Now you say that you "reopened" the case, and that Monika is in the loop. You keep changing your story to whatever is convenient at the time.

Why isn't Monika on the cc line? Would you mind if I went across the street and discuss this matter?

You provide no documentation of your claim that reopening a case is unprecedented. In fact, I recall a case at JPE about 30 years ago where the authors successfully appealed a rejection. The paper was rejected because of math problems that I had pointed out in my referee report. After looking at my comments, they wrote JPE, said they had fixed the problem, and asked for a reconsideration. JPE asked me to check out the new version, I told JPE that they had fixed the problems, and the paper was published.

The "stink" portion of my so-called "threats to raise a stink" would not focus the idiosyncratic details about how she handled the paper but what was said about economics methodology — in particular the prohibition on serious and systematic parameter sensitivity analysis, and the requirement that any second-year PhD student in any field of economics should be able to understand the paper. My "threats" were only telling you that I wanted to engage economics in discussions about substantive issues. Monika's clear statements demonstrated that my criticisms were not hypothetical, but did represent attitudes of at least one powerful editor. I thought you would have been sympathetic, but now you demand silence.

I do not stab people in the back. I do not hide behind anonymity in my comments. I make them openly, even signing many of my negative referee reports. I have often suspected retaliation was common at journals, so this does not come as a total surprise.

I may be suicidal, but you have hostages. I don't sacrifice young people.

Are you guys satisfied?

Ken

From: "James J. Heckman" <jheckman@uchicago.edu>
Subject: RE: Raising a Stink
Date: November 5, 2015 at 8:00:45 PM PST
To: 'KENNETH JUDD' <kennethjudd@mac.com>
Cc: 'Harald Uhlig' <huhlig@uchicago.edu>

Ken do as you want I am not going to be a party to a degrading exchange I do not know the full history of the JPE I may have misspoken

But listen to this

Raise a stink and quit the JPE

That's the rule on this paper

Period

And if you think I am bluffing just try to call it

I am sick of these tirades as all of us are

And sorrowful that you have fallen this low

The paper is good A great exception was made Maybe not unprecedented

But we are no obliged to tolerate irrelevant nonsense or attacks on the journal and its integrity

That's it

From: Harald Uhlig <huhlig@uchicago.edu>

Subject: Re: Raising a Stink

Date: November 6, 2015 at 1:07:16 PM PST

To: KENNETH JUDD <kennethjudd@mac.com>, JJH Heckman <jheckman@uchicago.edu>

Ken:

The point is: Jim meant to do you a HUGE favor, per re-opening this submission or allowing a new submission of this paper, whatever you wish to call it. Normally, people that receive a huge favor, send other e-mails.

Harald