

JSH: James Harris is going to POP! AGAIN !

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-02/msg02283.html>

- *From:* "killoff-JFHism@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx" <spamless@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 12 Feb 2007 00:38:05 -0600
-

JSH has been "spewing pure hate" into this good newsgroup for too long. Instead of ever asking questions, he insults, time for this Crackpot/Troll to go, and Google will help us do it. Let's report this guy at Google Groups and get him blocked. He may be fun for some of you, but it is a poison, for him and you. Read below how much hate he posted in a few days Can you imagine this guy ever working for you? I would fire him on the spot, have him marched out with armed guards. Just some of his hate over the past few days, put this guy away in a nuthouse, and out of sci.math, time to clean up and clean out)

James Harris – The real frustration for me when dealing with sci.math regulars is the insistence on lying about the details, so let me set the record straight on my paper on non-polynomial factorization, which was the one published and then withdrawn by the editors after some convincing emails by some sci.math regulars. In the original paper, I declare the ring to the ring of algebraic integers. That can be proven to not be true by using other arguments. So it is the declaration at the beginning of the paper which does not remain true over the length of the paper which is the source of objections. Two ways to handle that, of course, I could simply declare something different. Or, I could do what I did in my revision, which was to note that the ring declaration COULD NOT HOLD which is the point of the paper. That is no one can declare anything less than a field and have the operations hold through the paper, which is the over-turning result. Now I came back, after I got over the anger enough to even bother with the sci.math newsgroup again, and argued with at least one of the people who falsely attacked my paper to the SWJPAM editors, and conceded all of his main points, and still showed that my conclusion held. What did he do? The fucker just kept on claiming he refuted me. I conceded all of his main points—the mathematical ones—and STILL my conclusion holds and away he goes claiming I'm still wrong, when I am FUCKING CONCEDED HIS MAIN GODDAMN POINTS!!! THAT is your society. You people just lie. You lie, and then LIE some more, and then you LIE about lying. James Harris

I am still puzzled which is why this situation may continue for a little while longer as I never, ever thought that you people would sell out the United States, put lives in jeopardy, and act like no one would care as if no one would be bothered by dead soldiers or dead civilians because some "mathematicians" decided they couldn't be bothered with telling the truth. But I am more and more less interested in figuring out what brain

JSH: James Harris is going to POP! AGAIN !

dysfunction afflicts you people than in moving forward to protecting my country and ending this bizarre situation. I am not ready to give up the United States. This chess game moves to a new level. I will move to protect the king, and I do not think the Queen is yet in jeopardy. Nukes don't bother me, but I will not stand for a certain happening. I need a demonstration of faith. There are some flies and gnats that annoy me. Permission is granted to remove them, with extreme prejudice. There are few limits, but those limits that are there must be heeded. An example is in order, but make it a big one, and make it soon, as in 24 hours. ___JSH

That has never before been seen and it chops up a lot of crap that math professors are STILL teaching their poor pitiful students. Yep, you are pathetic if you're absorbing that crap when I've disproven it multiple ways. Now go read up on class number and see how wrong mathematicians got it before. Oh, yeah, that resut can be used to figure out how factors of 4 distribute!!! But that's next as I have to draw this out as you see—there are math people DELIBERATELY lying about these issues. I need to draw them out, so you can understand that they want to do this, and are doing it fully consciously and with malice aforethought. James Harris

I figured out a way to factor integers into factors that are not roots of the same monic polynomial with integer coefficients irreducible over \mathbb{Q} . Damn hard thing to figure out how to do as I've been working on it for years. By accomplishing it, I show that the standard view of Galois Theory is wrong, and class number is meaningless as a useful concept. Easy. Why don't you find the polynomials with integer coefficients for the examples I've given? That's a start. Oh, part of the reason for starting there is that then you can consider what you think you know about how factors of 4 will distribute between the roots. And then see why that's wrong. James Harris

Because I'm a real mathematician, and you're not. Answer my question, which two roots multiply to give 4 as a factor? And remember Decker at the end of this you are not a university professor. Not only do you not deserve that position, but because your school backed you with your stupid webpage attacking my work, I go after the school as well. How about \$100 million dollars as a lawsuit? I think that's kind of low, but it's a start. James Harris You people have no clue about what's coming as you are not really mathematicians, so you look around see a possibly unsteady world but keep thinking that it is rock stable in ways it's not. My projections indicate that without substantial thinking on the part of humanity approximately 6 billion people will die within the next 30 years. These days will seem like paradise if you survive the next 10 because with those numbers the odds are that none of you reading this post will be alive. It's that close. Intelligence is more than just a label. Solving problems is more than just a nifty idea. This month a few things are going to happen. Maybe then some of you will get some perspective. But I'm not hoping as my take on it is that most of you lack even a modicum of the intelligence necessary to grasp world events on the level that are about to occur. Oh well, it's not like you have to understand. They will happen anyway. James Harris

And notice now the insults. THESE PEOPLE TURN TO INSULTS IMMEDIATELY WHEN

JSH: James Harris is going to POP! AGAIN !

JSH: James Harris is going to POP! AGAIN !

CHALLENGED! They can't win without insults. Consider that please—they can't win without insults. That's how this gets political, as when math people start insulting, they push buttons that they have to push to keep people from paying attention to the facts. My contrasting example is to ask you, would Tiger Woods go after amateur golfers in this way? How about John Elway after amateur football players? Getting out of sports, would Bill Gates occupy his time attacking amateur programmers? And if he did, wouldn't you wonder a bit about how amateur they really were? Yet mathematicians get away with attacking "crackpots" with a great deal of energy and effort, including the assault on my paper by email, and then they go on and on about the mathematics being unimportant? How stupid do they think you are? If Tiger Woods goes after a golfer about his game, do you think that golfer really has no skills? Of course, Tiger Woods wouldn't. What would you think of him if he did? Math people, in contrast, do go after amateur mathematicians, and with a viciousness. So why do they not pay a penalty then? Why can a mathematician behave viciously towards a "crackpot" and still walk away from that behavior unscathed? The point of this thread though is that people claiming my paper was already refuted by arguments on sci.math are lying, as in reality there was a highly technical and minor claim made against the paper for declaring a ring, which doesn't hold as the ring through the entire paper to its conclusion. Yet the point of the paper is that ring is not capable of holding true despite basic algebraic operations being used. So objectors used the very thing that makes the paper so important, to claim it false, and to prove that they did so, I can simply note that the ring of algebraic integers does not hold as the ring till the end. Oh yeah, I should add that I DID explain in detail, once I got over being furious, as hey, these people are powerful. They blew my paper out of the water with some freaking emails, and I hoped maybe I could reason with them. Sci.math'ers demonstrated they can control a math journal, and even destroy one. So I explained in detail, accepting major points, and STILL the bastards just kept lying. They just kept lying. It doesn't matter how much I explain or how logically I step it out. At the end they will insult me, and claim I'm wrong, no matter what proof is given, or who agrees with me. Just like they went after that journal with a fury. And they did destroy it. James Harris

The word "object" in object ring gives you an important clue, as consider $1/2$. Do you have $1/2$ or do you have $1/2$ of something? Now if you have $1/2$ of something then do you not actually have 1 object out of a set of 2? The object ring includes all numbers such that you have objects and not set operations is another way to look at it, as I consider $1/2$ to be a set operation meaning take 1 of 2 objects from a set. So I don't see $1/2$ as a number, but instead as an instruction. James Harris

is correct? The quadratic has TWO SOLUTIONS. Now I don't think this is rocket science. I think you just lie. And readers should remember that part of the story here is that sci.math posters—a few of them—have fought this research for years quite successfully, convincing many of you against mathematical proof, and they even managed to get a paper of mine censored, and in doing so, killed a math journal. They have no conscience. They have a contempt for the truth. Contempt for your intelligence and love of mathematics. And they have betrayed your trust over and over and over again.

JSH: James Harris is going to POP! AGAIN !

It is crucial that you understand that these people are doing this deliberately, so that you, finally, stop trusting them. Just go with the mathematics. Actually follow the mathematical proofs. Your trust in your society is being exploited by people with a contempt for knowledge—and a contempt for you. James Harris

Contradicting your own position by turning to the very behavior you accused me of. People like you lack a conscience. The mathematical proof isn't even hard, but trust is hard to challenge. Readers, the saddest point I'm making is that people many of you think are on your side, just use you. One dead math journal so far, and a lot of students still being taught flawed mathematical ideas. Tomorrow is another day for professors who don't give a damn about the truth, to abuse the trust of young people coming to them for learning. Consider what is being fought for here. People without consciences are fighting against humanity itself. James Harris

Quote from JSH: I WILL GET MY MONEY If you fucking morons think that I will let you get

away with not giving me credit for my fucking math discoveries then you have another fucking thing coming. What the fuck??!!! Where's "pure math" now, huh? Where's loving math for the fucking beauty of it now you fucking shits??!!! LOOK AT IT!!! Here is the partial difference equation and instructions for integrating. $dS(x,y) = [p(x/y, y-1) - p(y-1, \sqrt{y-1})][p(y, \sqrt{y}) - p(y-1, \sqrt{y-1})]$, $S(x,1) = 0$. And $p(x, y) = \text{floor}(x) - S(x, y) - 1$, and you get S as the sum of dS >from $dS(x,2)$ to $dS(x,y)$. <http://mathforprofit.blogspot.com/> You fucking shits. I will get credit for my discovery and get fucking paid, and you best believe that I will not fucking let you stupid fucks get away with your fucking stupid bullshit—"pure math" my ass—without me coming at you fuckers with some fucking PURE fucking PURE AS FUCK math that you stupid shits have been shitting on for over a fucking YEAR!!! You goddamn FUCKS!!! What the fuck is wrong with you shits??!!! Don't you even believe in your own stupid shit? Where's "pure math" now? Where is it?