Re: JSH: The "Published" paper he dosen't what you to know about.

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006−09/msg04241.html

- *From*: jstevh@xxxxxxx
- *Date*: 20 Sep 2006 19:39:19 −0700

marcus_b wrote:

> jstevh@xxxxxxx wrote:
>
> > marcus_b wrote:
> >
> > <deleted>
> >
> > > One of the simpler cases to which your result should
> > > apply is when f = sqrt(5). In that case, the polynomial
> > > equation above becomes
> > >
> > > a^3 + 12 a^2 − 65 = 0.
> > >
> > > This is a monic polynomial with integer coefficients.
> > > It is irreducible over the rationals. The roots
> > > are algebraic integers. Dedekind's theorem
> > > and Galois theory both say that none of the roots are
> > > coprime to f^2 = 5 in the ring of algebraic integers.
> > > You however infer that one of the roots IS coprime
> > > to 5. And since you are saying that Galois theory is
> > > wrong, you must be saying that it is wrong in the ring
> > > to which it applies: the ring of algebraic integers.
> > > From which we must conclude: you think one of roots is
> > > coprime to 5 *** in the ring of algebraic integers.***
> > > This is inescapable.
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > Why go in circles? I already note that the result isn't true in the
> > ring of algebraic integers, so why come back and claim that I'm saying
> > it's true in the ring of algebraic integers?
> >
> > It's trivial math too.

> > You're doing what other posters have tried to do which is claim I'm saying what I'm not, and denying the reality that I acknowledge that none of the roots can be coprime to 5 in the ring of algebraic integers.
>
> Your paper says Galois theory disagrees with your algebra. The Galois theory in question applies to the ring of algebraic integers, not to arbitrary rings. Therefore you must be saying that your results − particularly your claim that one of a1(m), a2(m) or a3(m) is coprime to f − must apply in the ring of algebraic integers. Otherwise you have no reason to say Galois theory is incorrect.
>
> Marcus.

It's false implication.

One can correctly say that 2 is coprime to 6 in evens, right?

But what if some mathematician proclaims that means that 2 is coprime to 6 in a larger sense?

No one would, of course, because you know that 2*3 = 6.

But what I've done is prove a similiar situation where it's not so trivial to point to the error, so mathematicians who if they admit the error have no accomplishments in their entire careers can dance around the proper conclusion.

So that means that Galois Theory doesn't say anything differently for non−rationals than it does for rationals as the ring of algebraic integers is irrelevant.

The ring of algebraic integers is a historical oddity, with no mathematical importance.

Taking the roots of monic polynomials with integer coefficients doesn't have any real import in a mathematical sense, but is just some quirky idea some people thought might be useful−−−and it wasn't.

James Harris

.