

## Re: JSH: One mystery remains

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-12/msg03837.html>

---

- *From:* [jstevh@xxxxxxx](mailto:jstevh@xxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 11 Dec 2006 18:03:50 -0800
- 

T.H. Ray wrote:

I want to know why any of you would think that I am wrong at this point.

Because mainly, you have provided no context in which one could even possibly think that you are right.

So publication in a peer reviewed math journal is not such a context?

One does not just "throw out some ideas" and "play around with some concepts" and come up with what is, to a mathematician, a recognizable proof.

Proof has form and meaning. You have to supply that, not your reader.

Forget the calculational examples. Even aside from the fact that many of them are clearly wrong, they have no meaning outside of theorem and theory.

Mr. Harris, it really is not all that difficult to learn proof methods. Yes, it is hard to execute them, and hard to know which to apply to the problem at hand. If your object is to convince anyone that you know what you are doing, however, you must challenge yourself to learn the language.

Tom

Groupthink.

One of the most important events for me was getting to talk to a leading mathematician at my alma mater Vanderbilt University where I

Re: JSH: One mystery remains

could hash it all out on the chalkboard, which was done at his request.

I drove over four hours from Atlanta at his request so that I could explain it in person—on the chalkboard.

Only took a couple of hours and we were in agreement on all of the major points, but inexplicably to me, he just went home and sent me an email later about how much he had enjoyed the conversation!

In reply I went off on him, and yup, I guess I ranted a bit as I could not comprehend how I could explain every point, get agreement on the math, and him just go on about his business like nothing.

Oh yeah, he did say I lacked "polish" which goes back to that learn the lingo thing, but when a mathematician can understand what I'm saying and follow the math, then "polish" is really just about style, now isn't it?

And why in the modern math world is style so much more important than anything else, even proof?

Or even publication?

So AFTER I had that drive to Nashville and that conversation, and the long drive back home wondering what in the hell had happened that I could explain, get agreement and then nothing, I kept at sending my paper to journals and SWJPAM published!!!

I thought it was finally over.

But the sci.math newsgroup erupted, as publication meant NOTHING to them.

NOTHING.

Publication in a peer reviewed math journal meant absolutely NOTHING to sci.math'ers.

There is no way to convince you people, as groupthink rules you.

Nothing means anything to you, not stepped through proof, not publication, not knowing that the hammer is about to fall as I have nice simple explanations and am back to writing papers.

Even knowing that the hammer will fall this time, and that you can't get away again with bushwhacking a journal to get a paper censored, you people blissfully chant nonsense, as if the real world doesn't exist.

But it does. And in the real world, publication does mean something. Proof does matter, and though it can take a while to convince people, once they are convinced, they act.

Re: JSH: One mystery remains

Re: JSH: One mystery remains

James Harris

.