

## Re: Factoring paper is wrong

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-06/3671.html>

---

**From:** Quinn Tyler Jackson (*quinn-j\_at\_shaw.ca*)

**Date:** 06/17/04

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 2004 05:32:37 GMT

JHiN said:

> *(I've drawn my own conclusions with a cursory  
> review.)*

You drawing conclusions with a Crayola.

> *I'm not satisfied – only one of the "editors" is  
> listed as a mathematician.*

Editorial Board & Contributors. Old, out of date listing. Hmm... let's draw some conclusions based on outdated data temporarily stored on a server while the main site is down. (Maybe the up to date site is up — I don't know. Maybe it is the same as that one — I don't know.)

Which is which? Who is who? Care to draw more conclusions? I'm not an editor, neither is James. Round and round it goes, where it lands, nobody knows. Well, you know. But ... yeesh — technically, you're nobody — so indeed, nobody knows.

Not nobody? Who *\*are\** you, anyway? An anonymous ellipses. You don't even exist, JHiN, except in vaporspace. So far, I'd say you are a computer. Whoever wrote your program failed the Turing Test.

> *Any other "mathematicians" in this little group  
> of yours, who reviewed Harris' work?*

Who knows? Who cares? Who knows who cares? Who cares to know? Whose nose cares?

> *Any idiot balancing his/her checkbook can call  
> themselves a mathematician, but that doesn't  
> qualify them to find errors, or to judge a paper  
> if they find no errors.*

And any poorly written ELIZA program hooked up to an email account can attack people from behind a thin sheet of anonymity and call itself a critic. Who wrote you, Grampa Simpson?

sci.math: Re: Factoring paper is wrong

Good God, man, I gave you ample opportunity to call my bluff on my absolutely outrageous claim about having invented an efficient Type  $< 2$  parsing algorithm, and you were so busy running line 20367 of your program that you insisted instead that I answer a question Einstein had already answered.

If you were truly hanging around to protect the Integrity of the Body of Knowledge of Mathematics, surely you would have grabbed that freebie opportunity with both hands and called my bluff, told me to put the cards on the table about such a boisterous claim.

But instead of focusing on my outrageous claim of invention, you elected to go all Crayola Computer on me and draw conclusions about a small, private list and the nature of its participants. You focused on a question that was already answered by a third party instead of the obvious one that would have allowed you to call yourself Quinn Tyler Jackson is Nuts(R).

Time to get Grampa Simpson to review your code. Maybe he forgot that GOTOs make spaghetti code.

--

Quinn

Note: If you had the balls to stand behind your real name -- I'd treat you with more respect. In the meantime, you technically don't exist.