

## Re: SF: Back to theory

**Source:** <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/sci.crypt/2005-02/5073.html>

---

**From:** W. Dale Hall ([mailtowd-hall\\_at\\_pacbell.net](mailto:wdhall_at_pacbell.net))

**Date:** 02/28/05

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 17:12:14 GMT

jstevh@msn.com wrote:

> *Nora Baron wrote:*

> <deleted>

>

>> *As in many other instances he has his own nonstandard definition*

>> *of 'liar'. A 'liar' is someone who disagrees with James Harris.*

>>

>

>

> *Sigh. Here's why I call "Nora Baron" a serial liar.*

>

> *For some years this poster has obsessively replied to my posts, and I*

> *noticed a while back that when I explained ideas out carefully and in*

> *detail in reply, this poster would just ignore the facts, no matter how*

> *often I explained or how carefully I stepped through.*

>

With the exception of having applied the "takes one to know one" principle, you are in no position to deem Noramanaplanacanalpanama Bamanaplanacanalpanamaron's actions as constituting obsession. It is not obsession to be tireless in rejecting falsehood and error.

It is a matter of fact, not merely opinion, that your explanations are rarely "careful and in full detail". Rather, they are typically merely rehashed (if not simply cut-n-pasted) versions of the same old argument.

As far as ignoring the facts, please present us with some evidence (i.e., quoted excerpts of articles on sci.math) of this. Your track record regarding facts is about as reliable as your track record regarding mathematics (i.e., it's poor).

> *Also, the poster made a Nora Baron post ending with the name "Andrzej"*

> *and there's another sci.math'er who used to obsessively reply to my*

> *posts, ignoring the facts no matter how detailed my replies who used*

> *that name.*

>

"No matter how detailed"

is not an indication that your articles were either correct or to the point. Please show us a set of excerpts that show that NoradamImada BadamImadaron, er, Andrzej Zdrzlvlxmjzrnmphlk, replied inappropriately to articles of yours where you turned out to have been correct.

> *When caught, the poster claimed that the male name was the pseudonym*  
> *and was being retired, while the "Nora Baron" name is supposedly the*  
> *real name, but it is suspiciously a palindromic name.*  
>  
>>>*From my perspective the lying about math is what's most important while*  
> *the weird sex thing is just that, weird.*  
>

Did either NorablewasIereIsawel Baron, or Andrzej Kzlmzjrjwlrkmkskx, ever state his or her gender? If not, how does this have anything to do with lying? As I recall, the first time I responded to an article of yours, you accused me of having some gender flaw.

> *AT this point, it's anyone's guess what sex this poster even is, and as*  
> *for their mathematical statements, I've found that yes, the "Nora*  
> *Baron" poster may say things that are correct up to the point that*  
> *telling the truth would mean accepting one of my major conclusions.*  
>

This is stupid. Your so-called "major conclusions" are typically in error. Face it. As far as the "sex" thing, absent any explicit statement claiming a gender, no one's gender can be assumed, especially on-line.

> *So that's why I say the poster is a serial liar. Take your pick, lying*  
> *about their sex, or lying about math, there's a lot of lying going on*  
> *from that person whomever he or she really is.*  
>

On the math count, you're simply incorrect. As far as your claims that Norabdefg Bgfedcbaron has lied about his/her/its gender, well, that's your hang-up. I saw no claims one way or another, and think you've got a bug up yer wazoo about this.

Maybe you're a serial doofus.

>  
> *James Harris*  
>

Dale.