

Re: JSH: Math as a religion

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-01/msg04609.html>

- *From:* jstevh@xxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 28 Jan 2006 07:58:18 -0800
-

Jesse F. Hughes wrote:

> jstevh@xxxxxxx writes:
>
>> jstevh@xxxxxxx wrote:
>
> [piggybacking, since I never got the original]
>
>>> You are no longer mathematicians or people really interested in
>>> mathematics, but just members of another religion and so, like people
>>> who are religious versus logical, you cannot be convinced by logical
>>> means.
>
> Really, James, the plagiarism of ideas is getting out of hand here.
> First you try to claim the mathematical predictions banner from Petry
> and now you trot out his mathematical religion rant. I fear that
> next, you'll say something about meaning and computation.
>

I don't know of any Petry.

RULES. You people are proving you are part of a religion by the rules you break.

By the rules that supposedly govern math society, my results are settled.

But you change the rules as you see fit, showing that you are not people who are logical but are people who have beliefs which they hold onto no matter what, like members of most religions.

It's the rules that you break that prove you are not rational, and when I point that out, being religious on the issue you claim you don't break your own rules.

But I have a peer reviewed and published result, where the proof is so basic that it looks like a kid's homework problems from algebra, and challenges can be shown to be attacking the distributive property.

The reason the rules are broken with my result is that among other

Re: JSH: Math as a religion

things it proves that Andrew Wiles didn't prove Fermat's Last Theorem, as it takes away the wrong usage of Galois Theory.

By the rules there is no way to challenge my research as I have mathematical proof.

By the rules you can attack my claim of proof, but then you must show an error in the argument and your refusing to accept the distributive property does not show an error with the proof.

It shows you just don't want to believe a mathematically correct result, and being human beings you can just say, no.

You are members of your own religion that you just call mathematics.

Your breaking of your own rules proves it.

James Harris

• ***Follow-Ups:***

◆ ***Re: JSH: Math as a religion***

◇ *From:* mensanator@xxxxxxxxxxxx

• ***References:***

◆ ***JSH: Math as a religion***

◇ *From:* jstevh

◆ ***Re: JSH: Math as a religion***

◇ *From:* jstevh

◆ ***Re: JSH: Math as a religion***

◇ *From:* Jesse F. Hughes

• Prev by Date: ***Re: Name for congruence relationship ?***

• Next by Date: ***Re: cartesian vector notation***

• Previous by thread: ***Re: JSH: Math as a religion***

• Next by thread: ***Re: JSH: Math as a religion***

• Index(es):

◆ ***Date***

◆ ***Thread***