

Re: JSH: Learning consensus

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-05/msg05697.html>

- *From:* jstevh@xxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 30 May 2006 17:32:36 -0700
-

Rupert wrote:

jstevh@xxxxxxx wrote:

Reality of "pure math" is that you depend on some other person saying an argument is correct.

That's just fact.

Absolute nonsense. Anyone with any intellectual integrity checks for themselves that the argument is correct.

But human nature is that you can fail to see your own mistakes, and those of others you believe in.

I know, I've been there.

I've looked at arguments over and over again, wanting them to be true, and hoping they were true, unable to see for myself that they were wrong for long periods of time, but thankfully, I have always escaped the trap of wanting something false to be true.

The problem with "pure math" is that you ultimately rely on human judgement, which means you ultimately rely on human fallibility.

Remember the main point I have isn't that mathematicians lie to themselves and others, but that by not having computer checking they show that on some level they KNOW that there are major errors that no one wants to know about, or accept.

Computers offer the promise of objectivity and escape from human fallibility.

Computer science people can listen with amazement as mathematicians and other math people go on and on about how computers can't comprehend mathematics, knowing what I know, computers can do it—but math people

Re: JSH: Learning consensus

don't want to be checked objectively.

They want to rely on other people—people they trust, people who will protect their own.

They don't want their fate decided by an emotionless machine that will just tell the truth about whether a "proof" is a proof.

James Harris

.