

# JSH: Resolution now possible

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-10/4946.html>

---

**From:** James Harris (*jstevh\_at\_msn.com*)

**Date:** 10/17/04

Date: 17 Oct 2004 07:13:23 -0700

After over two years of arguing on the specifics of my techniques of polynomial factorization which adds to even more years of arguing before about factorizations I think it's finally clear how to move to resolve all the issues:

1. My position is that the definition of the ring of algebraic integers requiring roots of monic polynomials with integer coefficients is arbitrary and misleading in that you can have numbers properly units that are excluded on the technicality that they are not roots of monic polynomials with integer coefficients.
2. In support of my position I have given the full algebraic argument showing a contradiction between numbers shown to have a specific factor, versus exclusion of that factor in the ring of algebraic integers based on a technicality.

My work in this area has faced several formal peer reviews and not shown to be flawed, though some sci.math'ers have diligently argued otherwise and even actively interfered in the journal process by sending emails to a journal that had a paper of mine, and succeeded in cowing the chief editor Ioannis Argyros so that he withdrew my paper without proper cause and without even allowing me to defend against the charges the sci.math'ers made.

They broke him completely.

3. I have outlined a complete ring I call the object ring based on two primary requirements:
  - a. No rational unit other than 1 or  $-1$  is in the ring.
  - b. No non-unit member of the ring is a factor of any two integers that are coprime in the ring of integers.

Using that definition you can look back at numbers not units in the ring of integers and find that they are units in the ring of objects which shows how misleading the ring of algebraic integers can be.

Basically you can have  $u_1 u_2 = 1$ , where  $u_1$  is a unit, but while it is in the object ring it's not an algebraic integer because of the technicality that it's not the root of a monic polynomial with integer coefficients, and that means that  $u_2$  is not a unit.

Then you might assume that  $u_2$  because it's not a unit in the ring of algebraic integers is properly a factor of some other algebraic integer, when it's actually a unit factor.

*>From there you can continue to build a huge edifice of error, and unfortunately that is what occurred as an entire branch of mathematics was built up from this simple error.*

My mathematical position is absolutely solid, which leaves posters arguing about the details trying to convince that constants are not constants, though I can show they are relying on unit factors to make their arguments.

However, despite repeated explanations these posters continue with their assertions, and they have shown a willingness to step far out of bounds like with their coordinated email assault on my paper that went to the Southwest Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics:

<http://www.emis.de/journals/SWJPAM/vol2-03.html>

My take on the issue is that since it's readily explainable by using analogies like

$$x^2 + 4x + 3 = (x + 3)(x + 1)$$

and talking about how a corollary doesn't exist in the ring of algebraic integers that I can get some people to think about the silliness of fighting over arbitrary convention, as if just because some people over a hundred years ago put up a definition you can throw out algebra!

Over time some people should understand the argument, and see through the tactics used against me to gain an ever more negative opinion of the math community.

Over time that negative opinion, especially given that math professors continue to teach erroneous ideas—now possibly deliberately giving young minds false information—will likely move to specific actions against the math community, well within most of your lifetimes.

Given societies propensity for harsh penalties, some of you may face jailtime or significant loss of personal fortune, along with a great deal of shame.

My suggestion at this point is objectivity.

If I'm right you have nothing to gain and everything to lose by fighting correct mathematical results. While you may feel that you can win, that is the typical criminal thinking that helps to keep our world so interesting.

Criminals usually think they'll get away with it, so if you wish the adjective "criminal" added to you, properly, and face a very angry society down the road, as people take education kind of seriously, then continue as you have been doing.

Huge universities like Princeton or Harvard can be brought to their knees on this issue, and your academic colleagues probably won't be appreciative of the massive black eye that academia can get.

Alternatively, you can simply start playing fair, and I say start since sci.math'ers have repeatedly stepped over bounds, from nasty webpages including copyright violations, to coordinated email assaults, to just plain meanness in lots of little ways.

You have presented a story of hostility toward the world and against the truth, and even if you feel that was other sci.math'ers, don't make the mistake of thinking life is fair.

If a few years from now, you're sitting in a jail cell, wondering how you got there, or wandering the streets, unable to get a job, then the door will have been closed as you will not be able to come back to now.

James Harris