

## Re: Surrogate factoring, reasons for my concerns

**Source:** <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/sci.crypt/2004-07/0937.html>

---

**From:** David C. Ullrich ([ullrich\\_at\\_math.okstate.edu](mailto:ullrich_at_math.okstate.edu))

**Date:** 07/22/04

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 2004 06:25:21 -0500

On 21 Jul 2004 14:26:57 -0700, [cbrown@cbrownsystems.com](mailto:cbrown@cbrownsystems.com) (Chas Brown) wrote:

>David C. Ullrich <[ullrich@math.okstate.edu](mailto:ullrich@math.okstate.edu)> wrote in message  
news:<[qsuqf0pf8139mk78m9d1h0s4cfh39ctu1g@4ax.com](mailto:qsuqf0pf8139mk78m9d1h0s4cfh39ctu1g@4ax.com)>...  
>> On 20 Jul 2004 12:54:21 -0700, [jstevh@msn.com](mailto:jstevh@msn.com) (James Harris) wrote:  
>>  
>> >I'm going to top post here to point out that David Ullrich is one of  
>> >the people who posts who is an actual mathematician. He teaches at  
>> >Oklahoma State University.  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>> ><snip>  
>> >  
>> >Still he also posts a lot on sci.math and I've lost count how many  
>> >times he's called me an idiot!  
>> >  
>> >  
>> >By my count, only 16 times out of over 2100 replies; which I consider  
>> >tremendous restraint.

Heh-heh. Thanks for clarifying this.

Just curious: how did you compile these statistics?

>> Really? Could be I've called you an idiot, but I don't  
>> recall doing so.  
>>  
>> These are usually in the context of a single word of reply; for  
>> example:  
>>  
>> /From: David C. Ullrich ([ullrich@math.okstate.edu](mailto:ullrich@math.okstate.edu))  
>> /Subject: Re: JSH: More on ring issue  
>> /Newsgroups: sci.math  
>> /Date: 2002-02-03 07:37:02 PST  
>> /  
>> />> All of this is no joke as I did prove Fermat's Last Theorem, so  
>> />> your involvement in obscuring that that truth is of great

sci.crypt: Re: Surrogate factoring, reasons for my concerns

>/>>concern to me, while I feel that you may indeed honestly just  
>/>>not realize what the truth is.  
>/  
>/>Idiot.  
>  
>More often you use expressions of the form "when you say <x>, it makes  
>you \_sound\_ like an idiot" (at least 17 times); or "if your proof uses  
>undefined terms which you refuse to define you're making an idiot \_of  
>yourself\_" or similar (at least 9 times); which I consider as  
>statements about his \_posts\_, rather than implications that he  
>actually \_is\_ an idiot.  
>  
>These fall into the category of calling his \_arguments\_ "idiotic"; for  
>example:  
>  
>/From: David C. Ullrich (ullrich@math.okstate.edu)  
>/Subject: Re: JSH: Frustration, venting, weird group  
>/Newsgroups: sci.math  
>/Date: 2003-08-19 15:47:59 PST  
>/  
>/> Hint: Your traditional "this was all a test" thing works better if  
>/> you don't include idiotic statements like saying  $Z[1/2]$  is a field.  
>  
>I'd take that as attacking the argument, rather than the arguer.  
>  
>Of course, we must recall that in this case, the pot is at least as  
>guilty as the (putative) kettle; for who can forget these classic  
>JSH ripostes?  
>  
> "Fuck off!!! You fucking stupid idiot!!! How many times do I have  
> to tell you that your attention is not wanted David Ullrich?"  
>  
>Or the more urgent:  
>  
> "FUCK OFF David Ullrich!!!!!! Fuck off you stupid  
> fucking idiot!!!!!"  
>  
>As far as I can tell, \_you've\_ only called \_him\_ a "fucking idiot"  
>once:  
>  
> "My god you're a fucking idiot. It doesn't \_bug\_ people when you  
> talk about evil math society, it leads to gales of laughter. You  
> really haven't figured that out yet? Wow."  
>  
>> Trust me, if it ever did happen that I had a student  
>> who talked to me the way you do, he'd be gone \_long\_  
>> before things got to the point where I'd be talking  
>> to him the way I talk to you.  
>>  
>  
>Somehow, I can't imagine someone repeating the same basic algebra

sci.crypt: Re: Surrogate factoring, reasons for my concerns

>course for 6 years without gaining *\_some\_ knowledge along the way.*

>

>Cheers – Chas "*Just Keeping Score*" Brown

\*\*\*\*\*

David C. Ullrich