

Sugg  
 + structure grammatically.  
 say "He and [redacted] are the only two nonemployees amongst our sixteen."

either delete "an" as marked or insert "a" before "former"

An old-school guy who believes in introductions, Oaklawn marks our <sup>twelfth</sup> man. By *old timer* he means "longtime investor," being neither an employee, or former employee. Aside from OzoneAI, he's the only non-employee amongst our sixteen.

7/12/24  
 5/9/24

let "neither" you must use "nor" and there should be no comma in a "neither... nor" phrase (nor in an "either... or" phrase)



if "spike ups" and "spike downs" are stock market jargon, then OK as they are

by: [redacted]  
 I just read that we are #1 in short interest. That means there are a LOT of folks losing their ass — I hope they all go broke and I make a fortune as they cover. ...

Posted as a reply to: [redacted]

Where a falling stock price enriches those who have shorted it, the stock's increase sets them back conversely, something most investors, like Stu, delight in.

The longs like the pain this inflicts on shorts, where shorts are regarded as their natural adversary. Of course, the longest of the longs could care less, never even putting a face on the shorts, as this big-picture crowd doesn't even watch such daily action.

The trader likes shorts even more, or at least she should, in so far as "covering" accounts for a sizable percentage of spike ups, and indeed, the more volatile the market, the more upward bursts there are, as well as spike downs, which she buys into.

The net result of this action, as with what's offered by most media channels, is that you're assured of taking in lots of content you simply can't use, encouragement to exercise all those finger muscles used in clicking.

ditto "spike downs": "downward spikes" or "spike-downs" or "spikedowns"

BUT  
 let me know your pref. so we keep it consistent

sugg. changing "spike ups" to "upward spikes"; if not, sugg. either closing up ("spikeups") or inserting a hyphen ("spike-ups")

==/  
 0/0/

2/9/

"norms" of approaching a chat room having been put forward, as well as something antithetical to it in this one regard, it's now time to lay out the exceptions, three in number.

The first would be the group that Maynard likely falls in, which is a set of people who take their jobs so seriously that Yahoo, accordingly, gets assigned a low priority, from 9-5 (the above post was on a Friday night, by the way). Into this group with Maynard and his hundred pages a day, would fit Ozone, with 19% of his posts on weekends, and Ovrqta, at 27%, both well above the 11% average. Another reason to conclude that posting at work means little to these two is that they're also among the lightest posters of the sixteen. Where the average person posted forty-three times a month during their busiest months, Ozone's average, as I said before, in 17,027, was 13, and Ovrqta's was only 8.

The second group of posters who post liberally on weekends, but without showing signs of being compulsive, are retirees. For those out of the workforce the distinction between the five main days and the other 2 is much reduced (although not nonexistent). Our only two retirees did exceed the 11% average, if only somewhat, with RetiredMCIengineer at 13% and Oaklawn at 17%. With only two retirees, this is less definitive than my earlier group of the non-addictive, who recorded substantially higher numbers.

The third, and last, group that my seventeen-month review led me to home in on was a subset of posters who were unusually serious and generally more sophisticated who would pop up mostly on weekends, ask a question, get an almost instantaneous answer, and then quickly disappear. These answers would tend to come from other no-nonsense investors who were similarly disinclined to hang out for long stretches, distinct from the lonely and the clinically ill. A small disclaimer on this last finding is that it seemed to be more pronounced in 2000 than in the twenty-two-month period for which I actually tabulated things.

All the above takes into account normal trading conditions over time. During massive sell-offs, as witnessed periodically from 2000-2002, the weekend population explodes, drawing in newbies and longtimers alike.

~~ADD A APPAREL~~

9/100/

9/three/

9/13/thirteen/

9/six/

9/two/

9/1/

9/1/

9/1/

stat

9/# to #/

when you use "from" you need to use "to"

stat/

nine to five

5/

9/

CHANGE "IN THE FUTURE" TO "DURING ONE OF THEIR TOMORROWS"? → And what of the walks through history by the crowd working double-overtime? Do they do it with "virtual" footsteps? Perhaps they'll walk in the flesh in the future, at least those not struck down by massive strokes and heart attacks. CAN THIS 2 TO A BE MARKEDLY IMPROVED?

author's questions

my response:

To be honest, I think you could eliminate this A altogether, but if you want to keep it in, this is what I'd suggest (or something along these lines):

And what of the double-overtime crowd? Do they take "virtual" walks through history? Or are they waiting for their futures, when all the long hours will supposedly pay off in free time and riches (for those not struck down by massive strokes and heart attacks)?

jk

words that convey malevolency directed at specific groups of people, such as

See reverse

For calling [redacted] an "idiot" as he did, I chalked this up as a "slam," yet <sup>1/m</sup> consistent with his sensibilities on the obscene, addressed in 25,553, where he sticks his finger with a fish hook, [redacted] had an extremely low slam rate, the second lowest, in fact, at 3%, with [redacted] sitting at zero. Regarding profanity, I rarely used it as a criterion, in and of itself, in tabulating anyone's slam rates, or for threats of physical violence.

Barring <sup>9/and/and</sup> ~~trait~~ specific words like "nigger," "faggot," "cunt," I personally regard few words as taboo, placing me at odds with [redacted]'s sense of absoluteness on this. Just the same, I share some of the sentiments along the lines of "how far is too far" and "what makes for counterproductive language" that he and others hold to, which gets touched on later.

As for [redacted]'s ultimate treatment of vulgarities, they seemed, for the most part, to let it slide when such language was used merely to underscore a particular point, as opposed to being directed at somebody personally. You do see a liberal dose of the unwholesome in the work of [redacted], for example, but did you ever sense that it offended anyone?

In order for the reader to be able to tie in "yet" with the statement that [redacted] had a low slam rate, some punctuation needed to be adjusted in addition to the parens you're adding. The final result should look like this:

"... as a slam, yet <sup>1/m</sup> consistent with his sensibilities on the obscene, addressed in 25,553 (where he sticks his finger with a fish hook) <sup>1/m</sup> [redacted] had an..."

The em dashes visually separate the phrase <sup>that sits</sup> between them and allow the reader to connect "yet" with "[redacted] had"

determining

I think this is what you were wanting to say...? "trait" is definitely NOT the right choice

(1/1)

but I thought it was worth it for the parallel it drew with the series from [redacted], starting at 22,268, where he may also have been spurred on by [redacted] to do his best writing (being non-comedic, in that instance).

(cap) /

Smack on the heels of the eleven-entry series just prior came a post string from a fellow name [redacted]. Was he, too, obnoxious and excessive? Actually, they were the [redacted]'s posts that [redacted] had merely brought over from the [redacted] board, for the general edification of the [redacted] readers, showing our strongman pushing people around on a brand new front.

seven = ?

9 / seven = ?

There was, in that series, an assault on [redacted], followed by an ambitious campaign against [redacted] designed to drag his name through the mud for all of the [redacted] to enjoy (and this was *not* the same series mentioned recently by [redacted]).

change to "PROGRESSION"

In the four months since [redacted] first arrived on the board, he managed to log 511 posts, not counting the ones which got deleted. How many did he register on all of the [redacted] chat rooms combined? I've left that for another to count.

9 / that /

sugg: That I've left for another to count.

[redacted]

Msg: [redacted]

by: [redacted]

Msg: [redacted]

(Cut by author)

by: [redacted]  
You sure? What Location(s)?

Msg: [redacted]

[redacted]

His nostrils flaring, the ~~P~~asset ~~W~~ound hunts for specifics. How many would have rested after just the first question?

The greater question, however, is *this* - how many times has he cycled between going long (as this query suggests he might be) and going short? Have you seen such versatility in anybody else?

c /  
d / (cap) / (Hah) /  
(cap) /

(cap) /  
(cap) /

5095  
9

dog breeds are not proper nouns, so are not capped (unless the breed name contains a proper noun, like "German Shepherd")

lc x 2 /

1 / m /

Author's question

This series of excerpts, from the sort of trade journal that [redacted] is accustomed to reading, backs up more of the firsthand accounts the posters have offered thus far, as well as illustrating how [redacted] sticks to their guns on what John Callahan had said in the article six days before in 27,957 about the initial difficulty in pinpointing causality, and with it the apportionment of blame.

The perfect consonance between what our industry insiders have said and what is now covered in [redacted]'s piece is impressive, starting with the sketch of the Nortel products involved, touched on by [redacted] in 28,403, and ending with [redacted]'s pronouncement that the "fault was one of method" in 27,977, mirroring as it does the wording above, that it was a "process problem" and "not a software problem."

The last paragraph in [redacted]'s piece also provides further reason to believe that Oviqta might have been made privy to more technical insight from higher-ups than were most other reps. Where she said, "...management has kept me...directly informed..." in 28,461, [redacted] indicates that the customer base at large had not felt that those in sales were adequately informed.

THESE 1ST 3  
AS ARE  
ROTATED WEAK.  
CAN YOU  
OFFER ASSISTANCE  
WHILE STILL  
SAYING THE  
SAME BASIC  
THINGS? I'M  
IMAGINING THAT  
THE ELIMINATION  
OR RE-ARRANGING  
OF 2-5  
CLUMSY WORDS  
WOULD DO THE  
TRICK.

All one  
sentence  
to be  
broken  
up (is  
all  
several)

my  
gugg.

This series of excerpts — from the sort of trade journal [redacted] is accustomed to reading — supports many of the firsthand accounts offered by our players. It also illustrates how [redacted] sticks to its guns on what John Callahan said, in the article posted in 27,957, about the initial difficulty in pinpointing causality, and with it the apportionment of blame.

The perfect consonance between what our industry insiders have said and what is covered in [redacted]'s piece here is impressive. That the [redacted] products never went down was pointed out by [redacted] in 28,403. And the quote from a company spokeswoman that it was a "process problem" and "not a software problem" mirrors [redacted]'s pronouncement, in 27,977, that the "fault was one of method."

And the last paragraph in [redacted]'s piece gives us reason to believe that [redacted] might have been made privy to more information from higher-ups than were most other reps. Where she said, "...management has kept...me...directly informed..." in 28,461, [redacted] indicates that the customer base at large felt that those in sales were not adequately informed.

The first two paragraphs were each one long sentence so I broke them up. The first paragraph didn't need much more than that (altho' I did substitute em dashes for commas in that first sentence).

The second ¶ needed a little more work — besides breaking it into three sentences I did a little rearranging.