

Re: Long threads, tactics

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-10/4538.html>

From: Nora Baron (norabaron_at_hotmail.com)

Date: 10/16/04

Date: 15 Oct 2004 17:06:15 -0700

jstevh@msn.com (James Harris) wrote in message
news:<3c65f87.0410141816.4c5f47c4@posting.google.com>...

- > *If you look over the thread where I've been working on another paper*
- > *you'll see a good reason for creating new threads.*
- >
- > *That one is now coming up on a 100 posts, with a lot of them coming*
- > *from people who spend a lot of their time on Usenet trying to obscure*
- > *what I'm saying.*
- >
- > *They do this deliberately, and it's an effective tactic.*
- >
- > *I've checked in various ways to watch interest in my work as it works*
- > *its way around the world, as I move Google search results. As I post*
- > *here Google and also Yahoo search results shift, so I watch them, and*
- > *I can sort of map how effective some of these posters are.*
- >
- > *Real mathematicians would want to get to the bottom and find out*
- > *what's true, but these people are practiced at trying to control what*
- > *you think on the subject.*
- >
- > *If you didn't know it's worth mentioning that Erik Max Francis, a*
- > *person who put up an insulting but popular webpage--according to*
- > *Google which ranks it now about 9 for the name "James Harris"--used to*
- > *post a lot on sci.math, and by now you should know about the*
- > *sci.math'ers who got together to send emails and censor my paper out*
- > *of an electronic math journal.*
- >
- > *These people are serious, and they have been practicing for years, as*
- > *have I.*
- >
- > *As of now, I do more than move Google search results, as what I say*
- > *gets read by quite a few people worldwide and it travels.*
- >
- > *Kids read it, adults read it. People who think read what I say.*
- > *They're learning more about how even the math world is corrupted in*
- > *ways they're seeing all over the world in many places, from Catholic*
- > *priests, to businesses, to politics.*
- >

- > *They're a new generation, and they're learning rapidly.*
- >
- > *And what people arguing with me say, travels.*
- >
- > *The words weave their way out from here, and I can watch the war as it*
- > *progresses around the globe, in waves, as attacks and battles play*
- > *out.*
- >
- > *It's a fascinating struggle with me on one side and a dedicated group*
- > *of people on the other, and they're not stupid people.*
- >

This is new!

- > *By myself I have had to slowly slog through in what is basically a war*
- > *of attrition, and part of that war is moving on when a thread gets*
- > *clogged up by these people.*
- >
- > *Tomorrow I'll be looking at Google search results again to see how*
- > *they've moved.*
- >
- > *Now, as I've put out this latest flurry of postings, they're moving on*
- > *a day by day basis.*
- >
- > *It's that big. The impact on the math field is like nothing that has*
- > *ever come before, and even at the fringes, like replies from obsessive*
- > *posters, the impact is already worldwide.*
- >
- > *It's like a growing hurricane.*
- >

This is simply delusional. It's more like a tempest in a mudpuddle.

- >
- > *James Harris*

You have systematically run away from the core argument, which centers around your idea of "constant terms" of a function. Here is how your "logic" goes:

-
1. Define the *constant term* of any function $h(m)$ to be $h(0)$.
 2. Assume $v_1(m)$ and $a_1(m)$ are functions of m . The function $a_1(m)$ is known to be nonconstant, and $a_1(0) = 0$. The function $v_1(m)$ may or may not be nonconstant. We know that $v_1(0) = f$, a prime integer.. Your goal is to show that $v_1(m)$ must be constant.
 3. Consider $g_1(m) = a_1(m)*x + uf$, where u and f are constant

with respect to m .

4. Define $h(m) = g_1(m)/v_1(m)$. Then the constant term of $h(m)$ clearly must be $uf/v_1(m)$, since uf is obviously the constant term of $g_1(m)$. On the other hand, the constant term of $h(m)$ by definition must be

$$h(0) = uf/v_1(0) = uf/f = u..$$

This is a constant which is independent of m .

Therefore $v_1(m)$ must be a constant function. Therefore it must equal $v_1(0) = f$ for all m .

You may argue that I have not represented your argument correctly. There is a crucial step above with which you may not agree. That is in item 4, where it says

"Then the constant term of $h(m)$ clearly must be $uf/v_1(m)$."

Perhaps you think I am misrepresenting your logic in that step.

But here is a direct quote from what you said on Oct 10 in a post in another thread:

"Well, let's put that to the test "Nora Baron" and see if the algebra reaches you.

Consider $a_1 x + uf$, and you claim it has a factor that is $v_1(m)$ that varies with m , now just divide through by that factor and you get

$$a_1 x/v_1(m) + uf/v_1(m)$$

and you can see that the term constant with respect to m is now $uf/v_1(m)$."

Those are YOUR words. YOU say the "constant term" is $uf/v_1(m)$.

The rest of your "logic" is, I believe, correctly represented in steps 1–4 above.

If you disagree, please say why. If you DON'T disagree, then we should have a discussion about definitions ...

Now look back over what you have written above. There is no math. It is nothing but propaganda, aimed at some imaginary audience from which you want sympathy. Look back over my reply. It is math. It focuses on a central part of your argument. It is brief and self-contained. You could try responding to it, but I think you won't. You prefer the windy propaganda route. You keep wondering why the rest of us are effective and you are not. You think, we have some kind of authority that you don't. People believe us because we are Professional Mathematicians, whereas you are an Amateur. You think, we know the lingo and can use it to pull the wool over people's eyes. You think, we all get together and agree on a party line that is designed to shut you, the upstart amateur, out. You think we are jealous of your raw talent. You think we want to protect the math status quo. You think you are the misunderstood genius, and we want to suppress you because you threaten our jobs, etc.

All this is fantasy. We do not conspire. We do not resent or fear amateurs. We do not convince people by snow-jobs and language. We are not jealous of your raw talent: you are not Gauss or Dedekind or Wiles. If people believe us more than they believe you, it is because they recognize sound arguments when they see them and they recognize hand-waving and evasion when they see it. Most people have pretty good built-in B.S. detectors. They clearly see you run away from arguments. They see you whine and brag and pontificate. They see you gloat over imagined victories of your "math" over ours, of having "broken" one or the other of your opponents. They see you brand anyone who dares to disagree with you as a liar. They see you going farther and farther into a la-la land of self-delusion, fantasy, and bitterness.

Face the math head-on Face up to the fact that you have not, and cannot, find an example where Galois theory breaks down. Face up to the gaping hole in your "constants are constant" argument. Face up to Dale Hall's computations, rather than continuing to promote your quack claim that he is making a hidden assumption. Face up to the fact that there are at least 4 *independent* proofs that your main claim in APF is wrong and that we have pointed out a wild leap off the end of the pier right in the middle of what you think is a "proof". Stop saying no one has pointed out a major error; it has occurred many times.

Try being honest, not with us, but with yourself. If it turns out in the end that you have been wrong, accept it and move on. Start over if you want, or consider getting out of math. Continuing to lie to yourself is a mug's game

sci.math: Re: Long threads, tactics

and eventually you will pay a heavy price. The longer you extend the lie, the higher that price will be.

Nora B.