

Speak for Yourself, Mr. Meade

A Public Response to Your Assertion of Inaccuracy in the Matter of Pat Porath

To: Peter Meade – Publisher
Casino Enterprise Management Magazine

Mr. Meade,

I have received the August 2006 issue of Casino Enterprise Management Magazine and I read with interest, your statement on page 75 in which you profess to speak for my contributing writer, Pat Porath. The statement expresses regret for an “inaccuracy” in your publication of his “Quick & Simple Repairs” article, originally published in the November 2005 issue of Slot Tech Magazine. In an attempt to somehow spread the blame around and mitigate your responsibility for publishing an article to which one of your advertisers has objected, you have included Mr. Porath in the statement. He is the only person mentioned by name. You don’t even sign it with your own name.

Mr. Meade, I strongly protest this very public statement in the name of my contributing writer, Pat Porath. There was absolutely nothing inaccurate about anything that was written in this article. Mr. Porath has no reason to be regretful as his report was 100% accurate at the time of writing. A slot tech’s reputation is everything in this closely-knit business. For Casino Enterprise Management Magazine publicly to attack Mr. Porath’s reputation and label his article “inaccurate” is completely unacceptable.

Mr. Meade, I am dismayed by your actions. I am aware that the manufacturer under discussion is one of your advertisers and that this advertiser contacted you, expressing displeasure at the publication of what they viewed as outdated material. Instead of contacting me directly to discuss the situation,

you contacted my writer, Mr. Porath, at his place of employment and, under color of authority (if I may be allowed to bastardize the term just a bit), proceeded to browbeat him about the “accuracy” of his report. In my subsequent discussions with Mr. Porath, he admits to being left with the distinct impression that he had done something wrong, so much so that:

a.) He offered (and you accepted!) his offer to write a nice little testimonial about how swell the games mentioned in the article are, seeking to patch things up a bit with your advertiser. He did this within hours of your telephone call to him.

b.) He was too upset and worried by the event to contact me about it.

That was July 13th. I had to learn about this nearly a month later when I read your supposed “combined” statement in the August issue of Casino Enterprise Management Magazine. It arrived in the mail on August 10th.

So, Mr. Meade, let’s examine just why it is that you blame Mr. Porath and Slot Tech Magazine for your dilemma. In support, I quote you from your e-mail to me of August 5, 2006 in which you (finally!) express your displeasure with me (but conveniently fail to mention anything about the public statement which you know will be distributed in the coming days). This is a cut-and-paste job, with only personal data edited.

----- begin -----
It was my understanding that our initial agreement was that you would have supply CEM with articles to reprint only one month prior to their appearing in Slot

Tech magazine. The agreement was verbal and not formal. It was a gentlemen’s agreement. If it was going to change I should have been notified and alerted to the possible problems it might cause CEM. I had assumed that the articles you were supplying [my employee] with were not outdated. I would also assume that you can easily understand why printing an article that alerted readers to a technical glitch could be problematic if the article appeared as current after 10 months went by. Most manufacturers address such issues ASAP.

----- end -----

So, you seem to be “pissed off” (your words, not mine) because you think I pulled a fast one and sent you old material in violation of an agreement. You confessed to me in the same e-mail that you were embarrassed when confronted by your advertiser. **And this is why you seek to punish and embarrass Mr. Porath, a working man**

A reprint of a Slot Tech Magazine article appeared in the July '06 issue of Casino Enterprise Management. It was titled, “Quick and Simple Slot Repair” by Pat Porath. This article supplied to us by Slot Tech Magazine was from their November 2005 issue. The electronic problems discussed in the reprinted article have been resolved by the manufacturers cited. We have verified this to be true. As we published this article which dated back to almost one year ago, it appeared that the discussed problems were current. This is not the case. Both CEM and Mr. Porath regret this inaccuracy.

This statement was published in the August 2006 edition of Casino Enterprise Management Magazine

who does his very best each day as a slot tech in a casino in Michigan? Because you were embarrassed and you want to spread it around? **What the hell is THAT all about?**

First of all I can't possibly supply you with articles prior to their publication in Slot Tech Magazine as you mention in your e-mail. They don't exist before they're published. If you meant to say "subsequent to their appearing in Slot Tech Magazine" then you're completely wrong.

I offer the following e-mail as incontrovertible proof that you knew (or should have known, as publisher) that the specific article under discussion was originally printed in the November 2005 issue of Slot Tech Magazine. Notice the date.

--- begin copy of e-mail ---
From: Randy Fromm
[mailto:randy@randyfromm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2006 11:16 AM
To: [CEM employee]
Subject: Re: Slot Tech Magazine

I will offer you my "Quick & Simple Repairs" column for a little while because I want to put a bit more distance between the initial publication in Slot Tech Magazine and the subsequent reprint in CEM. We're only a month apart. I'd rather it be six months.

On the upside, I can send you the next six month's contributions right away. I'll put them in your sub-dir and let you know when they're there via email. Thanks Randy
---end of e-mail ---

So there you go, Mr. Meade. You can't possibly say that I didn't keep you fully informed as to when these articles were first published. I point out as well that by accepting for publication this six-month series from Mr. Porath, you were fully aware that the sixth installment would be published in Casino Enterprise Management a full year after it first appeared in Slot Tech Magazine.

I even provided you with .pdf versions of the articles as they appeared in Slot Tech Magazine so you could check the layout I used. The original publication date is printed right on the copy! In addition -- do I really need more proof? -- you pick the files off of my server and the name of each subdirectory is THE DATE OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATION. E.G. "June05, January06, etc.

It is disingenuous to suggest that you didn't know the original date of publication. Bringing this up now and claiming, ex post facto that we had a quid pro quo for the provision of material no more than one month old, is inconsistent with the facts.

And regardless, why would you drag Mr. Porath into things? If you felt that Slot Tech Magazine had let you down by allowing archival material to be reprinted in CEM, your beef was with ME, the publisher, not a contributing writer. What the hell were you thinking? Your behavior is that of a school yard bully.

Mr. Meade, here at Slot Tech Magazine, we spend a lot of time talking about how things fail in all types of equipment. Often, our articles come many months or even years after the problem has been resolved at the factory. However, unresolved issues still persist in the field because some tech in some far away town hasn't heard about it.

Not every operator receives the CNs (Customer Notifications) from the OEMs. If an operator is not an "authorized customer" they will not have access to the technical website and will receive neither CNs, software updates nor technical bulletins directly from the OEMs. These operators (from across the globe) depend on independent slot tech message boards (internet) and, yes, Slot Tech Magazine in order to obtain the data they need to repair and operate the machines.

I have never been threatened by any manufacturer and I've been publishing these types of articles for 30 years. In fact, the contrary is mostly the norm, where manufacturers cooperate with me in disseminating accurate repair information. These are the same manufacturers that are my current advertisers by the way and I salute them and appreciate their support in this regard. Speaking as a technician, it means more to me than the advertising revenue.

But I guess the advertising revenue is more important to you and I respect that. That's why we're all in business and I'm not going to suggest otherwise. But I will not have my technical writers spooked by the possibility that there will be some sort of retribution if they do something as straightforward as describing a repair that was made to a slot machine.

This is reportage, Mr. Meade and on a technical level at that. We're not evaluating anything and we're not making subjective comments about "quality." This was simply a report about how a repair was performed around the time of November, 2005. The technical articles in Slot Tech Magazine are meant to be educational and, as such, are valid no matter when they are presented.

Perhaps if you had printed the date of original publication, all this might have been avoided but that was your editorial decision to make, not mine. You certainly knew the date of original publication. To mention Mr. Porath at all (especially in the same sentence as the word "inaccuracy") and to make it appear that he is somehow to blame is unconscionable. You really owe Mr. Porath a prominent apology in Casino Enterprise Management Magazine.


Randy Fromm - Publisher