

Re: Surrogate factoring, update

Source: <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/sci.crypt/2004-07/0605.html>

From: Tom St Denis (tom_at_securescience.net)

Date: 07/15/04

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 2004 19:24:52 GMT

<snip>

Let's do some clue hunting for James shall we.

I, Thomas James St Denis, citizen of Canada am bound to the Canadian Criminal Code.

Let's do some peeking around...

Section 297-316 [<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46/42515.html#rid-42654>].
Defamatory Libel.

Since what James is beating around is actually libel [openly publishing false statements to injure another] let's read what the law says.

(1) of 298 states "A defamatory libel is matter published, without lawful justification or excuse, that is likely to injure the reputation of any person by exposing him to hatred, contempt or ridicule, or that is designed to insult the person of or concerning whom it is published."

Lawful excuse in this case would be that James is in fact not conducting a scientific process. He has repeatedly posted incoherent materials and made false conclusions detrimental to the further progress of the field of mathematics.

Section 300. "Every one who publishes a defamatory libel that he knows is false is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years."

So not only do I have to hurt you but I have to know it's false. In this case what I am posting is true. You really don't follow the scientific process and you really do waste peoples time.

Section 301. "Every one who publishes a defamatory libel is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years."

sci.crypt: Re: Surrogate factoring, update

That seems hard to enforce. You were given your chance to discuss without contempt. People reacting to your behaviour while perhaps guilty of section 301 are not likely to get prosecuted.

Section 308, while not directly on point does seem to parallel mediums of publication such as usenet. In this case my replies are to inform the public of your ill-reputation and the nature of your behaviour. e.g. the common good.

Section 309, "No person shall be deemed to publish a defamatory libel by reason only that he publishes defamatory matter that, on reasonable grounds, he believes is true, and that is relevant to any subject of public interest, the public discussion of which is for the public benefit."

Is exactly what I said for section 308. The public [in this case sci.crypt] is a scientific community not improved by lack standards and non-adherence to time honoured scientific process.

I really don't have to go any further. On section 309 alone I can prove I am innocent of Defamatory Libel.

Therefore, James, since I *DO* know the law on these matters [hint: google "defamatory libel criminal code"] I suggest you stop "offering" your advice. I'm not guilty of anything here except replying to a known Troll.

Tom