

## Re: [EGN] Variable hoisting

**Source:** <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.programming/2004-09/0459.html>

---

**From:** Programmer Dude (*Chris\_at\_Sonnack.com*)

**Date:** 09/10/04

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 12:48:42 -0500

More Edward G. Nilges lies....

>> 2. *In fact, I found a couple bugs, one I considered a typo (and note  
>> that the code style was so bad that this was missed by not only  
>> the original author, but also by a C expert (Richard)). The other  
>> very serious bug--a major design error--required two years for the  
>> author to even acknowledge.*  
>  
> *This is a lie.*

The facts are easily verified. The public record *\*exists\** for all.

> *This bug was found and fixed by me the same evening in May 2002 I  
> posted the code,*

In your dreams, perhaps. Let's review the public record once again  
(yes, I know we did this just last June....now it needs doing again).

Doubting parties may use the date/time to locate the referenced posts  
in Goggle or the archive of your choice.....

BEGIN REPOST OF JUNE 2004 POST

~~~~~  
Subject; Re: The Data Quality Act

Date; Wed, 26 Jun 2002 16:19:37

[Ed posts his C code string tokenizer...]

~~~~~  
Subject; Re: The Data Quality Act

Date; Thu, 27 Jun 2002 15:10:57

I spent a hour or so re-writing the C version to what I would  
consider good C practice (and per my own style just for example).  
In the process I found a SERIOUS bug in the C code. It occurs on  
line 131 of the C text, in the main parse function:

[...]

~~~~~  
[Ed still in denial two days later...]

Subject; Re: The Data Quality Act  
Date; Fri, 28 Jun 2002 12:33:39

CS> The allocated string has no room for the trailing nul.

RH> Sorry for missing this during my own review.

EN> You missed it because you know C and it isn't there.

Sorry, Ed, you're in *\*serious\** denial here. There are two major bugs in your "parsing" function. The first is exactly what I said it is, and I'll go over it more carefully for you. [...snip...]

> *You appear not to have done your homework, for if the bug had been in the original it would have blown up immediately, and you did not bother to test your proposed code scrap.*

Guess what, Ed. I loaded your original, unmodified (mod line wrapping) source into VC++ and it DOES crash reporting:

```
+-----+  
| DEBUG ERROR! |  
| Program: Test-D.exe |  
| DAMAGE: after Normal block (#40) at 0x00300150 |  
| (Press Retry to debug the application) |  
| |  
| [Abort] [Retry] [Ignore] |  
+-----+
```

~~~~~  
[Still swimming in De Nile...]

Subject; Re: The Data Quality Act  
Date; Fri, 28 Jun 2002 18:16:52

> *Dude claimed a bug which I have checked out and there is no bug in this code:*  
> [...]

[NOTE THIS: two days later, contrary to recent revisionist attempts by Ed, the reality was that at the time he (A) claimed to have checked the code and (B) denied any bug existed.]

~~~~~  
[Finally Ed begins to acknowledge there "may" be a bug...]

Subject; Re: The Data Quality Act  
Date; Fri, 28 Jun 2002 18:24:17

Re: [EGN] Variable hoisting

> *This MAY be a genuine bug.*

No MAY about it.

[...]

> *I think having written this that you probably ARE wrong, but I am  
> going to take your post home. You were certainly wrong on the null  
> length issue and at best are 1 for two down.*

~~~~~  
[Finally, four days later, Ed acknowledges (NOT FIXES)...]

Subject; Re: The Data Quality Act  
Date; Sun, 30 Jun 2002 23:24:16

> *OK. It appears that the malloc needed to malloc one more byte.*

Yes.

> *Chris is probably one for two since I believe a null string with a  
> string delim is handled.*

I'm afraid the other bug still exists. It has to do with what happens with you "parse" a string using string delimiting, but the string has no delimiter present.

~~~~~  
[Still no acknowledgement of error or simple test cases...]

Subject; Re: The Data Quality Act  
Date; Tue, 09 Jul 2002 17:05:02

~~~~~  
[And STILL not...]

Subject; Re: The Data Quality Act  
Date; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 13:06:19

> *I think the problem is that I presented end-to-end solutions which  
> worked the first time out,...*

No, they didn't. Your C solution crashed immediately and refused to run until I fixed your error. Even then it produced erroneous results due to the other bug. That's two major bugs in the single function of substance in your C solution.

Your VB solution at least runs, but it's poorly designed—particularly for a tool object. Worse, I say it ALSO produces erroneous results:

For the string: ",Moe,,Larry,Curley,,Shemp,Curley-Joe,CurleyJoeBesser,"

[NOTE: That was YOUR test string, Ed.]

Your VB routine claims there are \*nine\* tokens. Do you feel there should be a (blank) token \*after\* the final comma? That would make 10 tokens...

~~~~~  
[June this year, years later, finally (after asking a dozen times):]

CS> ..how many fields in the following CSV: ",John,,Rogar,Mick,"

EN> There are duh six fields in the string.

Exactly. So why did both your programs report five?

~~~~~  
END REPOST OF JUNE 2004 POST

So there it is, Ed. Proof once again that you are either insane or a very bad, very bald liar.

>> *1. My opinion of the coding style was a trivial matter mentioned in passing. An mature adult programmer would have taken it for what it was and moved on, not obsessed over it for years.*  
>  
> *Incorrect. You used trivial and personal rules about coding style as a basis for a personal offensive because you were being emotionally manipulated by Richard Heathfield.*

Another lie. The record above shows exactly what I said.

> *Of course, I welcomed constructive dialog NOT based on emotional manipulation by strangers working perhaps for anti-labor organizations and I've frequently engaged in collegial dialog.*

I doubt it. Your track record here is clear.

> *A characteristic of such dialog is studied lack of anxiety about whether one is an "incompetent" and a sign of this lack is that psychological transference in the form of the charge of "incompetence"*

Amazed me how you can write this apparently not recognizing that this is exactly \*your\* tactic, Ed. If you lack anxiety about your obvious lack of competence, why are you still obsessing over comments made over two years ago?

Clearly you feel threatened, and rightfully so. Any good programmer \*would\* be a threat to you.

And note how often you accuse others of incompetence and ignorance. Just as you say above.

Re: [EGN] Variable hoisting

Difference is, we know what's right and your accusations matter to us about as much as dog farts (which is to say that they smell foul, but quickly dissipate and are forgotten).

>> 5. *The author posted two versions, a C version whipped up in haste to further his agenda and a VB version—from the author's library of code, his ironically named "PowerString". Both contained serious design errors that caused erroneous results for certain input. I posted a VB version that delivered correct results and performed up to 40 times faster.*

>

> *In a collegial exchange, not based on deciding the zero-sum proposition "I'm a competent programmer and you're not", I would have been interested in Chris' changes.*

I would have offered—and have to co-workers—the exact same critique. (THEY weren't so threatened, though.)

> *As such, Chris committed theft of intellectual property and stolen product including the notion of a power string in the first place now decorates his Web site.*

Ed,... your claims of theft are just more dog farts.

And your public attempts at programming are indeed on display as an example of truly god-awful programming technique. Anyone with a morbid interest in defective code can view it here:

<http://www.sonnack.com/Chris/Software/Code/Toking/index2.html>

In particular, viewers might find Ed's original (nilges\_original.c) interesting to compare to the full re-write (nilges\_rewrite.c). If you were a maintenance programmer, which version would YOU prefer???