

## Re: Factoring paper is wrong

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-06/3198.html>

---

**From:** James Harris is Nuts ([nuts\\_at\\_jsh.com](mailto:nuts_at_jsh.com))

**Date:** 06/15/04

Date: Tue, 15 Jun 2004 17:48:56 +0000 (UTC)

On 15 Jun 2004, Will Twentyman wrote:

(snip)

>I choose to treat James with respect because personal attacks have  
>nothing to do with the validity or invalidity of his work. I am aware  
>that he frequently refuses/is unable to understand the  
>counter-arguments. I am aware that he often resorts to attacking those  
>who disagree with him. It is a simple matter to ignore the non-math and  
>deal only with the math. Doing so will reduce the amount of flames, and  
>hopefully help maintain the dignity and respect that everyone receives.  
>  
>When James attacks another person, he does more damage to his own image  
>than to the other person. Many of us understand that and are not  
>willing to make the same mistake.

I agree with the approach and sentiment. Good for you.

(snip)

>I suspect far more people treat him with respect than have respect for  
>him. There is a difference.

(snip)

That could explain my perspective that there has been too much deference recently to James Harris, especially in view of the withdrawn publication. Others on this NG proposed errata and counter-publication, which frankly ticked me off.

Such niceties should go to genuine amateurs.

In my non-humble opinion, James Harris has lost such privileges – his history proves it.

>--

>Will Twentyman

Re: Factoring paper is wrong

sci.math: Re: Factoring paper is wrong

>email: wtventyman at copper dot net

Will, I guess you missed Harris' latest diatribe of today (oh oh, your going on trial, and you'll be regulated and the law will against you):

>Subject: Re: Factoring paper is wrong

>Author: James Harris <jstevh@msn.com>

>Date Posted: Jun 15 2004 7:49:51:000AM

>QncyMI@netscape.net (Brian Quincy Hutchings) wrote in message

>news:<bde404c9.0406141631.54b6f069@posting.google.com>...

>> how did he happen to choose that number?...

>> do most "arbitrarily chosen numbers" have only two factors,

>> as opposed to being prime (or even more composited) ??

>>

>> richard@cogsci.ed.ac.uk (Richard Tobin) wrote in message

>news:<cakd67\$2r8a\$2@pc-news.cogsci.ed.ac.uk>...

>>

>> > (if I understand correctly) claiming that 34699508649151 is a >number

>> > that he can factor that doesn't have that property.

>>

>> --ils duces d'Enron!

>> <http://tarpley.net/bush7.htm>

>Why act like it's some major freaking conspiracy? I multiply together

>primes and then see how the factorization works with them!

>There is something really, truly wrong with you people.

>I've seen it time and time again over a period of years where some of

>you will work very hard to shadow a particular person and use

>insinuation, innuendo and anything else you can to always push the

>idea that they are just wrong.

>There was someone who posted in one of thse threads asking if I ever

>had anything right!!!

>Yet I have my prime counting function which was smeared but at least

>no one can say it doesn't work, but wait! There was a Usenet poster

>who went on and on for a while claiming it didn't!!!

>There's something wrong with you people on Usenet.

>And you don't even care that if your behavior were rational you'd at

>least wander away and do something else, as some of you have been

>doing this for YEARS.

>For years you have been shadowing my posts repeatedly posting in a way

>clearly meant to try and distract other people from anything I'm

>saying.

Re: Factoring paper is wrong

sci.math: Re: Factoring paper is wrong

>So now in testing out a factorization technique actually multiplying  
>prime numbers together and then seeing if it can factor them is so  
>strange.

>Oh, and I *\*do\** have a math paper that passed peer review, and when  
>word that it was to be published went out, what happened?

>Usenet posters from sci.math harrassed the journal claiming it was  
>wrong by email, and the chief editor Ioannis Argyros personally yanked  
>it the NEXT DAY, and told me afterwards claiming that one of the  
>Usenet posters was a reviewer!!!

>That paper is at ANOTHER JOURNAL YOU LOSERS and once again it is UNDER  
>PEER REVIEW and the journal it's at doesn't have a single weak editor  
>like Argyros that you rage filled people can bully.

>And when that paper comes out then the trial of Usenet can really  
>begin, and when the regulations come down and the laws and when your  
>words here are used against you, I'm sure that there will be hollering  
>all over Usenet.

>But you brought it on yourselves.

>James Harris

I told you ...

James Harris is Nuts(TM)