

Re: Computational complexity, number theory tidbits

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-08/0932.html>

From: C. Bond (cbond_at_ix.netcom.com)

Date: 08/04/04

Date: Wed, 04 Aug 2004 15:04:45 GMT

James Harris wrote:

[snip]

> > *Like to count the primes up to 10, you'd have*
> >
> > $10 - [10/2] - [10/3] + [10/6] + 2 = 4$
>
> *OOPS! Knew the answer ahead of time, so I cheated and screwed up.*
>
> *That should be*
>
> $10 - [10/2] - [10/3] + [10/6] + 2 - 1 = 4$
>
> > *and those primes, of course, are 2, 3, 5 and 7.*
> >
> > *Notice that you subtract all the evens, and then all the naturals that*
> > *have 3 as a factor, but you've over-subtracted in two ways, as 6 is*
> > *both even and has a factor of 3, so you subtracted for it twice, so*
> > *you add 1 back in, and then you add 2 in because you've subtracted for*
> > *2 and 3 along the way.*
>
> *And you subtract 1 for 1, which gives you 4.*
>
> *Well that's what I get for taking shortcuts.*

Then you have no business suggesting that others refrain from posting material which does not stand up to close scrutiny. Your own record in this respect is miserable.

> *James "Often in error, but never in doubt." Harris*

--

There are two things you must never attempt to prove: the unprovable -- and the obvious.

--

Democracy: The triumph of popularity over principle.

--

<http://www.crbond.com>