

Re: JSH: Fool all of the people, all of the time?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-12/5128.html>

From: James Harris (jstevh_at_msn.com)

Date: 12/05/04

Date: 5 Dec 2004 05:52:31 -0800

imaginatorium@despammed.com (Brian Chandler) wrote in message
news:<f2c35871.0412042036.542cbcd6@posting.google.com>...

> jstevh@msn.com (James Harris) wrote in message
news:<3c65f87.0412040746.3ff61803@posting.google.com>...

>

> [snip]

>

>> *Good question. But to believe that my results haven't traveled
>> through mathematical society at this point you have to believe that a
>> very basic argument, which I know I can explain in about an hour as I
>> did it in-person at my alma mater Vanderbilt University, which shoots
>> down one of the underpinnings of algebraic number theory could just
>> float out there, be argued about by me on Usenet for years, and never
>> get heard of by leading mathematicians.*

>

> *Impressive bit of sentence construction. Incidentally, though: "argued
> about by me on Usenet for years" – which bit is this? I know you
> seem to have been claiming to have found errors in 'core' for years,
> but I thought they were different arguments. Since as you say
> yourself, you've been wrong a lot in the past, and the important bit
> is the current argument, which alone of course is Correct, how long
> has this bit been going? I'd have thought less than "years"...?*

>

> [snip]

The full timeline is that back in December 1999 I first discovered an approach which would lead to the analysis tool of non-polynomial factorization.

It took a while though to figure out what I was doing as I stumbled about with various "proofs" of FLT that turned out to be bogus, but I kept working at it despite the failures, and time passed.

I think it was around two years later when I finally was fully using non-polynomial factorization in my FLT research, as I definitely was by November 2001. I focused on non-polynomial factorization itself, in discussions around May 2002, when I also discovered my prime counting function.

sci.math: Re: JSH: Fool all of the people, all of the time?

It's actually neat in that I discovered the prime counting function from trying to explain my FLT work! I was talking about simple polynomials, and I started thinking that hey, this could have something to do with counting prime numbers! It took me about two weeks from there to find the prime counting function.

I took some time talking about the prime counting function, and fiddling with it, and at times would also talk about non-polynomial factorization, and eventually I kind of settled into working on either one or the other up until recently.

Arguments on sci.math about non-polynomial factorization probably go back to before November 2001.

Over time I've pushed down quite a few of the early objections, which might surprise many of you who have a snapshot view, and don't realize how objections have changed over time.

The earliest arguments in this area go back to December 1999.

It's some of my most well-worked research, with almost every piece of it argued out over a period of years. Which is also why some of you may see me talking about having explained to various posters MANY times before, as I have.

> > ... *ill play out. People will eventually get tired of hearing from*
> > *posters who get caught in dumb lies, and there will be people who will*
> > *ask more and more questions.*
>
> *Newsflash!! People are asking questions!! Here's the commonest one:*
>
> *"What does 'properly a unit' mean?"*
>
> *Only you can answer.*
>

That's an old game of trying to cause major arguments over the use of some term or other, as I now simply shift from usage that sci.math'ers find easily works to provoke confusion.

What I find fascinating is that *clearly* some of you have worked rather hard to confuse the issue, hide the reality, and fight for arguments that just don't work, when I know that I learned years ago that it's just futile in mathematics to do those things.

And now some of you may finally be learning why, as I simply adjust explanations, and soon enough people will realize that you had to understand how it all worked to confuse them so well, and then they probably won't appreciate your efforts.

Re: JSH: Fool all of the people, all of the time?

sci.math: Re: JSH: Fool all of the people, all of the time?

After all, mathematics is objective in many ways. Sure some of you have personalized it, so that you can attack it as if it were mine.

But it's like if you hated Pythagoras and went after the Pythagorean Theorem.

You're not doing the world any favors, and fighting a battle you will lose.

These things have happened before, history repeats itself, and for some reason there are people like some of you who step out to fight what is mathematically true, for personal reasons.

James Harris