

will Arthur Rubin take the challenge or leave a messy and invalid Euclid IP proof on Wikipedia; can a senior Wiki editor enter and add a Dispute Tag Re: Correcting Wikipedia's Euclid's Infinitude of Primes Proof

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-04/msg01304.html>

- *From:* "a_plutonium" <a_plutonium@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 10 Apr 2007 12:31:55 -0700
-

I do not know how long Wikipedia keeps its TALK over disputes of a entry so I post to sci.math to get that date time group and permanence.

The Wikipedia page on Euclid's IP proof needs a Dispute Tag attached. The challenge is that Arthur Rubin's entry (at least he never denied he is the author of that entry), makes it impossible for him to deliver a valid IP both Direct and Indirect Method, because he has the two mixed up as one already. In order for Arthur to give a valid Direct and a valid Indirect would mean he has to peel away his present entry and give some elements to the Direct and other elements to the Indirect.

So I request some senior editor of Wikipedia, senior to Arthur Rubin since he is too close to the problem of this entry, to place a Dispute Tag on this entry.

--- quoting what I last wrote to Wikipedia TALK ---

Although I believe your argument is completely bogus, that's not a reason for failing to place a dispute tag on the article. The reason is that the dispute neither contained nor described in any reliable source, so we, as Wikipedians may not take notice of it. – Arthur Rubin | (talk) 18:51, 10 April 2007 (UTC)

Thanks for the reply Arthur. I guess you are truly the author of this Wikipedia entry since you do not deny the claim. And I guess the tag I seek is a Dispute Tag. I respectfully request from Wikipedia to apply a dispute tag. I can cite several sources that this Wikipedia entry is error laden. I can cite Karl Heuer in sci.math circa 1994, and Stillwell's book Mathematics and its History, and several in sci.math

leave a messy and invalid Euclid IP proof on Wikipedia; can a senior Wiki editor enter and add a Dispute Tag Re: Correcting

who have stated they believe Euclid's proof was Direct, plus my book written and published to sci.math on this subject.

But citations is not my best evidence against your entry, for my best evidence is that you are unable to give a valid Direct plus Indirect of this proof, because you have the two mixed up into one in your entry as is. Your entry starts as a Reductio ad Absurdum and moves on to a Direct method of a prime factor search. And to top it off, you are so confused with 30031 that you cannot even see that it is necessarily prime in the Indirect Method. Your entry in Wikipedia of Euclid's Infinitude of Primes Proof is a laughable and silly example of one who cannot see a clear proof argument. And it is authors like you who continue to burden the minds of young people trying to learn the TRUTH behind this proof. So, Arthur, take the test, I challenge you— write out a Indirect and a Direct proof of IP, what are you scared of? Why burden young people who want to learn with your messy and invalid proof ---- Archimedes Plutonium

.

will Arthur Rubin take the challenge or leave a messy and invalid Euclid IP proof on Wikipedia; can a senior