


**your paper submitted to JAMS** Inbox | X

☆ from **Weinan E** <weinan@math.princeton.edu> [hide details](#) Jun 24 (4 days ago)  
to ● **thenarmis@gmail.com**,  
Cheryl Cantore <cheryl@princeton.edu>  
date Wed, Jun 24, 2009 at 12:13 PM  
subject your paper submitted to JAMS  
mailed-by math.princeton.edu

Dear author,

It appears that your paper has been submitted to the wrong journal.  
JAMS publishes original research articles.  
Your paper appears to be a review article and should be submitted elsewhere.

Best wishes, Weinan

☆ ● **Stephen Crothers** to Weinan, [show details](#) Jun 24 (4 days ago) 

Dear Sir,

I think you have misunderstood my paper. I cite many sources, and quote them, but the fundamental mathematical arguments contained therein are original research. I note that the paper by Finster et. al. deals with related issues, and was published by the AMS. My paper demonstrates that the conclusions in the Finster paper are invalid, and various of their mathematical arguments misconceived, as typical of the broader community of writers on these matters. I seek to publish in the same journal as Finster et. al. The paper is attached again for your consideration.

Yours faithfully,  
Stephen J. Crothers.

☆ from **Weinan E** <weinan@math.princeton.edu> [hide details](#) Jun 24 (4 days ago)  
to ● **Stephen Crothers** <thenarmis@gmail.com>  
date Wed, Jun 24, 2009 at 4:09 PM  
subject Re: your paper submitted to JAMS  
mailed-by math.princeton.edu

Stephen Crothers wrote:

Dear Sir,

I think you have misunderstood my paper. I cite many sources, and quote them, but the fundamental mathematical arguments contained therein are original research. I note that the paper by Finster et. al. deals with related issues, and was published by the AMS. My paper demonstrates that the conclusions in the Finster paper are invalid, and various of their mathematical arguments misconceived, as typical of the broader community of writers on these matters. I seek to publish in the same journal as Finster et. al. The paper is attached again for your consideration.

Yours faithfully,  
Stephen J. Crothers.

On Wed, Jun 24, 2009 at 12:13 PM, Weinan E <[weinan@math.princeton.edu](mailto:weinan@math.princeton.edu) <<mailto:weinan@math.princeton.edu>>> wrote:

Dear author,

It appears that your paper has been submitted to the wrong journal.  
JAMS publishes original research articles.  
Your paper appears to be a review article and should be submitted elsewhere.

Best wishes, Weinan

There are many AMS journals. Your paper is not suited for Journal of AMS.  
If you wish, you can send it to other AMS journals.  
The paper of Finster was for Bulletin of AMS.  
You may try that journal if you wish.


Best wishes, Weinan

☆ from **Susan Friedlander** <susan@math.northwestern.edu> [hide details](#) Jun 24 (4 days ago)  
to amsb@usc.edu,  
● thenarmis@gmail.com  
date Wed, Jun 24, 2009 at 6:00 PM  
subject AMS Bulletin  
mailed-by kepler.math.northwestern.edu

Dear Dr Crothers

Thank you for your submission to the AMS Bulletin. However your article is not suitable for publication in this journal. BAMS publishes only a very small number of articles and we look for articles that appeal to a wide audience. You may wish to submit your article to a more specialised journal. This is important in the case of your article because it appears to be controversial in its claims.

best wishes  
Susan Friedlander  
Chief Editor

☆ ● **Stephen Crothers to Susan**, [show details](#) Jun 25 (3 days ago) 

Dear Madam,

Please explain why my paper is "*not suitable for publication*" in your journal, bearing in mind that you have recently published the paper by Finster et. al. which discusses the very same matters in relation to Kerr geometry. Are you really rejecting my paper simply because it is "*controversial in its claims*"? You have not mentioned any alleged technical errors in it. My paper demonstrates that the Finster et. al. paper contains gross errors. Do you even dispute that the so-called "Schwarzschild solution" is not Schwarzschild's solution, as "controversial", despite the irrefutable evidence - Schwarzschild's own paper!

Yours faithfully,  
Stephen J. Crothers.

- Show quoted text -

2 attachments — [Download all attachments](#)

 **AMS-paper.pdf**  
351K [View](#) [Download](#)

 **Finster et al.PDF**  
334K [View](#) [Download](#)