Re: A dead subject

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004−08/0491.html

---

From: Laserman (*jimzotos_at_yahoo.com*)
Date: 08/02/04

Date: 2 Aug 2004 14:00:24 −0700

"G. A. Edgar" <edgar@math.ohio−state.edu.invalid> wrote in message
news:<300720040808081178%edgar@math.ohio−state.edu.invalid>...
> *In article <57378408.0407291710.22a55b0b@posting.google.com>, Laserman*
> *<jimzotos@yahoo.com> wrote:*
>
> > *The quadratic formula has been around for thousands of years. I am*
> > *extremely surprised that no one has been able to derive a better*
> > *version of it to solve second degree equations, so, I will give you a*
> > *better version of the formula.*
> >
> > *Taking into consideration second degree equations in general,*
> > *ax^2 + bx + c,*
> > *set the expression like so... ax^2 = bx + c then identify*
> > *a,b,and c as you see them on the page. Next use*
> >
> >
> > *x = (b +−sqrt(b^2 + 4ac))/(2a)*
> >
> > *This version will give you the correct roots every time. Notice that*
> > *this version has 2 less minus signs and does not require setting the*
> > *quadratic equal to zero. For these reasons it is a better version. I*
> > *will give you some time to digest this and let it sink in. For those*
> > *of you that are interested I have 3 distinct ways of deriving this*
> > *version mathematically and will do so for you in the near future.*
> >
> > *Thank you very much,*
> > *Laserman*
>
> *Did you know that the "thousands of years old" formula was*
> *actually many formulas? Before they believed in*
> *negative numbers (or zero), they did quadratics in cases:*
>
> *a x^2 + b x = c*
> *a x^2 = b x + c*
> *a x^2 + c = bx*
> *a x^2 = b*
> *a x^2 = b x*

> *b x = c*
>
> *It seems you have done case 2 only...*

No you are incorrect, I have used case 2 to make a formula that is designed to lend itself easily for computation, even easier! I have made the formula easier, do you understand? All those mathematicians for thousands of years solving quadratic equations in all the forms you mentioned above and yet not one of them clever enough to see the better formula. NOT A ONE. You people do not WANT to see it, as I lay it before you plain as day. We are like Gallileo against the inquisition where you try to convince me to recant and say my version of the facts is not good enough because you refuse to see the light. Anybody else except Herman Rubin interested in the derivation?