

Re: JSH: Just plain silly

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-09/4814.html>

From: Mensanator (*mensanator_at_aol.compost*)

Date: 09/21/04

Date: 21 Sep 2004 00:35:19 GMT

>*Subject: Re: JSH: Just plain silly*
>*From: jstevh@msn.com (James Harris)*
>*Date: 9/20/2004 5:39 PM Central Standard Time*
>*Message-id: <3c65f87.0409201439.60025e3c@posting.google.com>*
>
>*"Quinn Tyler Jackson" <quinn-j@shaw.ca> wrote in message*
>*news:<cor3d.457042\$M95.321119@pd7tw1no>...*
>>> *I can understand why you might feel angry about this. I don't understand*
>>> *why you imagine that this is in any way my responsibility, unless you*
>>> *think it's wrong to inform a journal of an error in its publication.*
>>
>> *I don't blame you for doing what you felt you had to do. It was an*
>> *unfortunate (and probably not very well thought out) turn of events that*
>> *what happened happened the way it did. I am simply trying to explain my use*
>
>> *of the term "revisionist history" in light of the details I was aware of*
>> *when I first arrived on sci.math and cried foul about the whole affair. (I*
>> *leave it to interpretation as to whom should be held to account for the*
>> *alleged revisionism -- except to say that I certainly don't hold you*
>> *accountable for that, Dale.)*
>>
>> *Unfortunately, I'm not well enough versed in polynomial factorization to*
>> *comment on the merits of the paper in question, or upon the subsequent*
>> *critiques of same. Perhaps if it had been a paper on some branch of*
>*language*
>> *theory -- OK, maybe then I would be in a position to comment on the merits*
>> *of the paper itself. But I'm not.*
>>
>> *But I watched as the paper was accepted, put up on the site, the response*
>> *that followed, the pulling with the revised citation of the note I had read*
>
>> *only the night before as it was posted, and the subsequent hurling of*
>> *flames. I watched as claims were made that it was a clerical error that the*
>
>> *paper was ever accepted at all. I watched as James (and myself) were called*
>
>> *liars for stating that mathematicians hadn't pointed out the "errors" on*

>the
>> closed list. I watched how the comments came in about whether or not I was
>> some kind of spoofed identity of James Harris. I watched how the existence
>> of such a list was questioned. I watched ... and probably should have just
>> kept watching and shut the hell up.
>>
>> My quixotic nature, however, once again got the better of me and instead of
>
>> keeping the hell quiet, I spoke out against what appeared to be James
>> getting the short end.
>>
>> I'll drop it now.
>
>
>It's not the appearance that I'm getting the short end, but a basic
>betrayal by mathematicians of their own rules.
>
>To date the paper, while reviewed by some very highly placed people
>has not been shown to have a significant error, while a minor error
>pointed out by a sci.math poster has been fixed.
>
>So I have a paper which doesn't have an error in it.
>
>But posters on sci.math continue to rail against it, and offer up
>bogus claims against it, which I can shoot down with little effort.
>
>But it doesn't matter as mathematicians aren't playing by their own
>rules.
>
>Sure, you people may feel good that you can bluster an editor, like
>you did with Ioannis Argyros at Southwest Journal of Pure and Applied
>Mathematics, and you can excoriate people who post in support of me,
>like Quinn, who I'm replying to now, until they cry out, but you're
>just nasty people.
>
>History will judge you that way, as a vicious mob that reacted as so
>many mobs have when something they didn't like came to the fore.
>
>As I've noted, you demonstrate a hatred for mathematics, as if you
>like it when it gives you results you like, but hate it if those
>results challenge you in a certain way, like coming from someone like
>me, then you cannot love mathematics, as you do not love truth.
>
>Your disdain for mathematics itself is what will be most visible to
>future mathematicians who will justifiably hate you because they will
>fear being like you.
>
>Your own work may at times unfairly be tossed aside by people who have
>good reason to fear and mistrust you, but your complete lack of belief
>in mathematics and lack of love for it is shown by an apparent lack of
>caring about the obvious.

sci.math: Re: JSH: Just plain silly

>

>*So I speak before a crowd of the damned, cursed to be unloved*
>*throughout time, with only their hatred and bile to comfort them now,*
>*having betrayed what should have been their one true lover:*
>*Mathematics.*

Good work, Dante. Looks like that time you spent in alt.writing is starting to pay off.

>

>*You are a cursed and nasty people, and now you have nothing.*

>

>

>*James Harris*

--

Mensanator
Ace of Clubs