

Re: JSH: Questioning certainty

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-11/msg05603.html>

- *From:* "Tim Peters" <tim.one@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 21 Nov 2006 03:44:56 -0500
-

[Jason Pawloski]

Does anyone have a link to the post where James claims 2 is an irrational number? I was looking for it to add to my "greatest hits" collection but I had no luck (maybe the victim of deletion?) I also remember there was a witty commentary on JSH's work, saying something like "In [date] James made the startling discovery (assertion?) that 2 is an irrational number" and I thought it was on the CrackPot index, but I can no longer find it. Any help would be appreciated.

[Proginoskes]

"2 is a real number, in the same way that is an irrational."

from the post:

<<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.math/msg/112faecf3a3c1124?dmode=source&hl=en&utoken=pdK5VSgAAABcj>>

(Fri, Aug 11 2000 12:00 am, from "Recent quotes from James Harris" (sci.math).)

You /really/ need to browse that whole thread, and realize that JSH posted from different accounts way back then. It's hilariously "typical".

Having goofed about a different issue and been corrected, he persevered:

You're wrong.

A number that is not irrational and is not transcendental does not have "factors".

Transcendentals can still be said to have factors, as I've demonstrated.

And to help you out, I mentioned a practical application.

Re: JSH: Questioning certainty

That is, the $\sqrt{\pi}$ is scattered all through physics.

Still, I suspect that you'd rather chatter endlessly than just admit you made a mistake.

I'd rather not.

"WTF?!" It was pointed out then that, for example, 6 is neither irrational nor transcendental, so does that mean 6 doesn't have factors?!

Aha!

Well, I take this as evidence that your intellect has been compromised by your emot