

Re: WHAT THE MODERN MATHEMATHICIEN ARE SHY TO TALK ABOUT

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-05/msg03721.html>

- *From:* anzaures1@xxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 19 May 2005 14:39:24 -0700
-

OUTLINE? Which also happens to contain typos in most of the "outlined" formulas?

Then why are you posting your OUTLINE to sci.math?

Look, I have spent all day today writing OUTLINE (Introduction) Sections for 2 papers. When I add the Sections that contain actual proofs, I will make my results public. And shall ask other mathematicians to comment on the veracity of my results. But it would never occur to me to publish just the Introductions (Outlines) to my papers without the actual proofs and to expect others to verify my results just by looking at OUTLINES. How can anybody try to find a mistake in one of my calculations if all they see is an OUTLINE?

Moreover, you started this whole discussion by making the following provocative statement:

>In another words the modern mathematicien can not recognise that
>the great mathematicien can miss elementary proofs for long time
>and when are face with this proofs they become shy of talking about >
them They fall silent.

What PROOFS do they face? All you have presented is an OUTLINE. I like the way your outline looks! It is a beautiful outline. It has a lot of interesting Latin letters connected to each other by charming arithmetic operators. And the typos are very genuine.

But there are no rigorous proofs, which can be analyzed for their veracity.

When you produce readable PROOFS and not an OUTLINE, post them. Mathematicians will be very happy to point out to you all the places where you made mistakes in these proofs. But until you post PROOFS, nobody can look for mistakes in your proof, can they.

george ghiata wrote:

> Well.IT is my mistake .I should had said that it is only a OUTLINE

Re: WHAT THE MODERN MATHEMATHICIEN ARE SHY TO TALK ABOUT

> of the elementary proof of FLT, as Fermat did in his notes about
> the proof of FLT for $n=4$
> George G. Hiata

>>> About my presentation I want to say that all
>> statements are correct.

>> Are we supposed to take your word for it?

>>> If you take a pen and go from statement to statement
>> you may be able
>> to
>>> find what connects each other.

>> Yes. May be able. And may be unable. Let's face it:
>> you are too smart
>> for us. What's trivial to you is incomprehensible to
>> us.

>> Why don't you humor us, stupid mathematicians, and do
>> what we,
>> mathematicians, do: make presentations of our proofs
>> comprehensible to
>> others, so that they wouldn't have to "go from
>> statement to statement"
>> in the hope that they "may be able to find what
>> connects each other".

>>> It is a concise proof and the links between steps
>> are not shown but
>> can be deduce. ??

>> Well, maybe instead of posting tons of unhelpful
>> posts, you could
>> instead take a couple of hours and make your "proof"
>> less "concise".

>> But you don't even bother with re-reading the typos
>> that you make.
>> Like:

>>> Therefore $k=1$ must be divisible at least by 4

.

• *References:*

◆ **Re: WHAT THE MODERN MATHEMATHICIEN ARE SHY TO TALK ABOUT**

◇ *From:* anzaures1

◆ **Re: WHAT THE MODERN MATHEMATHICIEN ARE SHY TO TALK ABOUT**

Re: WHAT THE MODERN MATHEMATHICIEN ARE SHY TO TALK ABOUT

◇ *From:* george ghiata

- Prev by Date: ***Re: why would scientists have to listen to mathemacians and not theopposite?***
- Next by Date: ***Re: prove it measurable***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: WHAT THE MODERN MATHEMATHICIEN ARE SHY TO TALK ABOUT***
- Next by thread: ***Re: WHAT THE MODERN MATHEMATHICIEN ARE SHY TO TALK ABOUT***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***