

## Re: JSH: How easy? Wiles's work's flaw

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/6600.html>

---

*mensanator\_at\_aol.compost*

**Date:** 03/19/05

Date: 19 Mar 2005 07:20:13 -0800

jstevh@msn.com wrote:

> *David C. Ullrich wrote:*

> > *On 18 Mar 2005 15:25:35 -0800, jstevh@msn.com wrote:*

> >

> > > *It turns out that the logical flaw in Wiles's approach just jumps  
> out*

> > > *at you, if you're into logic, or statistics.*

> > >

> > > *Correlation "proofs" have been discounted for years, for good  
> reason,*

> > > *and his entire approach is an attempt at proof by correlation.*

> > >

> > > *He correlates elliptic curves to modular forms, as mathematicians  
> had*

> > > *found a modular form associated with each elliptic curve they  
> tested.*

> > >

> > > *The more astute of you might realize that if the techniques Wiles  
> used*

> > > *actually do appear to prove by correlation, then those techniques  
> are*

> > > *flawed, and in fact my research into what I call non-polynomial*

> > > *factorization proves they must be flawed.*

> >

> > *Uh, yes, \_if\_ he's "proving by correlation" then the proof is*

> > *no proof at all. But that's not what happens – he actually*

> > *gives a proof, no "correlation" involved.*

> >

> > *The question had been around for a while – people conjectured it*

> > *was so on the basis of this "correlation". He didn't announce*

> > *he'd proved the conjecture on the same basis.*

>

>

> *I normally ignore Ullrich's posts as, well mostly he doesn't actually  
> post mathematics, and I think a lot of his posts are meant to be some  
> kind of psychological thing, like he's trying to play mind games.*

>

- > Notice here he doesn't really say anything mathematical at all, but
- > that's not what I wanted to reply here to talk about, as I think it
- > worth mentioning that the *Southwest Journal of Pure and Applied*
- > *Mathematics* \*was\* at Cameron University, which is a part of
- Oklahoma's
- > state university system.
- >
- > And David Ullrich is a \*tenured\* math professor at Oklahoma State
- > University.
- >
- > But when posters started ripping on mathematicians at a sister
- > school--the editors of that journal--he said not a word that I
- > remember.
- >
- > Not a word of defense for professors at a school part of the system
- he
- > himself is a part.

Defense? He should defend their action in yanking your paper?  
Are you now saying yanking your paper was the right thing to do?

- >
- > Clearly *sci.math* is more important to David Ullrich than Oklahoma or
- > his fellow professors. He care more about what you people think than
- > the people who pay him, or why would he post so much here, yet not
- say
- > a single word in defense of his own?

Because they were wrong? Oh that's right, you're a veteran.  
You've been brainwashed to always defend your comrades, even  
when they're wrong.

- >
- > That journal is dead now. And for many of you it's just a little
- > thing.
- >
- > The school may or may not feel a hit from this spectacle, mainly I
- > guess because, who worries about Oklahoma?
- >
- > But one thing is for sure, David Ullrich doesn't. Even if he works
- > there.

Surely the closing a a journal that had become the laughing stock  
of acedemia is a good thing.

- >
- > He clearly doesn't feel like he owes them in the public eye, as I
- don't
- > remember him saying a single word in defense of the sister school.

And he's right, he doesn't owe them anything when they fuck up.

sci.math: Re: JSH: How easy? Wiles's work's flaw

>

>

> *James Harris*