

Re: .99999... still \neq 1

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-12/4373.html>

From: Brian Quincy Hutchings (*QncyMI_at_netscape.net*)

Date: 12/03/04

Date: 2 Dec 2004 20:11:27 -0800

whew; back to the old format, which is good, since it was impossible to see the "tree" in "v2."

the main point is that the folks who use p-adics blithely assume that the string of b-1s (in base-b) do continue, "out to infity to the left of the decimal," although that "point" is superfluous, except as a kind of reminder, just like one assumes about the underflow condition on the calculator, subtracting a larger numger from a smaller; one always has to make sure that it wasn't just the tail-end of a very long string of 9s.

anyway, if that was an apt characterization of Escultura's method, then it seems to be akin to AP's. if that is so, then it seems to be outside of the bounds of common-sense, since Fermat clearly meant the "last" theorem in terms of Diophantus, which does not include the subject of "p-adic valuations" --- not that I've read every thing about it.

but they're reputedly good for other stuff --- that is not **only** known to AP, I guess.

QncyMI@netscape.net wrote in message news:<1101967311.570933.283190@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com>...

> *I had said taht I found an *application**
> *of your alleged dilemma. if you look*
> *at Escultura's write-up for his counter-examples,*
> *he seems to use 0.9999... as a coefficient,*
> *namely to get somehting like 10-adics*

---le ducs d'Enron!

<http://tarpley.net/bush22.htm>