

Re: Peano's space-filling curve

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-06/1848.html>

From: John Morgan (john.morgan_at_REMOVECAPSataraxie.fr)

Date: 06/10/04

Date: Thu, 10 Jun 2004 10:06:01 +0200

Jesse F. Hughes <jesse@phiwumbda.org> wrote in message
news:87ekoq1dt1.fsf@phiwumbda.org...

> *"John Morgan"* <john.morgan@REMOVECAPSataraxie.fr> writes:

>

> > *My advice to you would be to visit a newsgroup that*

> > *devotes itself to topics related to, and as close as*

> > *possible to, the Dirac equation. Ask a simple*

> > *straightforward question about it, state your*

> > *antecedents clearly, then sit back and*

> > *wait for the sneering insults about your lack of*

> > *intelligence to roll in. Be persistent, and if you are*

> > *able to (this next bit is pretty tough, though), be*

> > *courteous and try to never respond in kind.*

> > *(I do, unfortunately, but what the heck)*

>

> *You forgot the part where you admonish the experts for*

> *failing to really think about their foundations. Then be*

> *sure that you tell them that in any other discipline,*

> *results and their justifications can be explained in a*

> *post or two, so what's wrong with them? It also helps*

> *to ask whether a well-known result is just "b*ll*cks"*

> *[sic] in that very first post.*

I don't think I need to point out that much of my post replying to Shmuel was slightly tongue-in-cheek. But you knew that already. If not, then you're not as smart as I imagined. What I do need to say is that sci.math is much better behaved than some newsgroups when a so-called "newbie" happens along. Which is why I didn't add the other stuff you propose, although I can think of groups where I would have poured in the irony with a cement mixer. N.b. I do write bollocks instead of b*ll*cks, but only when I really believe that it is :-)

> *Finally, repeat over and over that you are a "scientist"*

> *so they don't confuse you with a garden variety buffoon.*

Believe I did mention horticulture somewhere.

- > *Make proclamations that, as a scientist, you are*
- > *"forbidden" to use words like "impossible".*

And if you are only able to understand and use "straight" language, I feel sorry for you. There's not much fun in that.

- > *That's the best way to show your credentials.*

Perhaps it is, perhaps it isn't. But it seems to have got me the result I wanted, although none of the important steps along the way originated in posts from you. On the plus side, vis-a-vis your posts, I do enjoy replying to people who are as cantankerous as I am. Every "scientist" needs his RnR, even if pricking witches is a little unseemly these days.

I say. What naughty little boys we're being, going totally off-topic like this. I shall tell mummy you led me into it, so there!

- > *"That's the base tautological space where by tautological*
- > *space I mean a region of truth."*
- > -- *James S. Harris does philosophy of mathematics.*
- > *JSH is a renaissance man.*

And JFH his biggest fan? You do keep on quoting him so I suppose I should look him up in Whose Who. If I can get his addy I'll send him a note about good punctuation.

Cheers

John

At times I think there are no words
But these to tell what's true
And there are no truths outside the Gates of Eden
– Bob Dylan

P.s. If you need the BD poetry transliterating into "straight" language, please ask. Weierstrass said, "No mathematician can be a complete mathematician unless he is also something of a poet", but then maybe you are not a "complete mathematician". So. Tell me.

How does it feel, oh, how does it feel
To be on your own
With no direction home
A complete unknown
Like a rolling stone – B.D.

J