

## Re: JSH: Newsgroups mistakes, updated explanation and proof

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-04/msg02657.html>

---

- *From:* Rupert <[rupertmccallum@xxxxxxxx](mailto:rupertmccallum@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 19 Apr 2007 06:13:11 -0700
- 

On Apr 19, 3:18 pm, jst...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On Apr 18, 10:03 pm, Rupert <[rupertmccal...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:rupertmccal...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Apr 18, 11:20 pm, magi...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Arturo Magidin) wrote:

In article  
<1176868989.148917.236...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

Rupert <[rupertmccal...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:rupertmccal...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

The records of the past 10 years show that you have absolutely no capacity whatsoever for distinguish sound from unsound arguments, despite the patient efforts of many people to educate you.

Hmmm...

An argument is valid if the conclusion follows logically from the premises, invalid otherwise.

Re: JSH: Newsgroups mistakes, updated explanation and proof

An argument is  $\rightarrow$ sound $\leftarrow$  (in a given model) if and only if, in addition to being valid, the premises are true in the model.

I would say that James's record shows he has no capacity for distinguishing valid from invalid arguments. While he may also be incapable of distinguishing sound from unsound arguments, his record rests mostly on invalid arguments.

--

=====  
"It's not denial. I'm just very selective about what I accept as reality." ---- Calvin ("Calvin and Hobbes" by Bill Watterson)  
=====

Arturo Magidin  
magidin-at-member-ams-org

This is true in the sense that James usually starts his arguments with statements that are true.

I have a record of actually trying versus acting like I am trying.

I don't think you do. I think if you were really trying to achieve genuine mathematical success, you would pay attention when people offer you help and you would realize that their criticisms were correct the first time around, instead of the fiftieth. And you would realize that if you want to have a chance of achieving anything you need to acquire some background knowledge and get some mathematical training.

One of the more profound things I realized some years ago was that sci.math'ers were deliberately acting to confuse versus caring about what was mathematically true

Re: JSH: Newsgroups mistakes, updated explanation and proof

Why do you believe this silly nonsense? William Hughes just correctly pointed out the mistake in your argument. I independently identified the same mistake. It's the same thing that happens every time, except that usually you evade reality almost endlessly before you finally wake up. We're not trying to confuse anyone, we're just trying to help you.

and that happened when I wrote a very detailed rebuttal to "Nora Baron" only to have that poster delete out everything and just repeat flawed claims.

I can virtually guarantee you the claims weren't flawed. You want to post a link to the post and identify the mistakes?

It's easier to claim you are honest than to actually be honest.

I screw up. I make lots of mistakes in my search for truth and quite a few times over the years I have been rude, very wrong, and regretted things I've posted.

Well, if you regret being rude, why don't you make an effort to behave better in the future?

But I at least admit my humanity.

Well, except for the times when you seem to be under the delusion that you are some kind of superhuman, god-like being.

And in the world I thought I knew when I was growing up, human beings do those things and then some, because they work harder at being right, than just trying to look right.

Well, however it may be in your case, you don't seem to have much success in being right. Maybe there's something wrong with the approach you're taking? Maybe some radical change in the way you approach things is needed? Like maybe you could ask people for advice on what to read and actually read it? And politely ask questions about things you don't understand and listen to what people tell you? Or

Re: JSH: Newsgroups mistakes, updated explanation and proof

maybe you could just forget about mathematics altogether and try to achieve in some other area?

If mathematicians proved me wrong I'd accept that because I know fantasy, and I prefer knowing truth.

That's simply not the case. We constantly prove you wrong, and you never accept it.

But to the extent that they claim they prefer truth and rip on me as if the truth were the opposite, when I admit to being a very flawed human being just trying to get some things straight while these monsters pretend to be perfect—or very damn close to perfect—while they lie, and lie, and lie then I say we have a serious problem people.

Here's a simple challenge for you: Name one lie a sci.math poster other than you has told in a JSH thread.

The monsters have taken the high ground, and made it illegal to be human.

They spit on mistakes made in the search for truth.

They try to help you in your alleged search for truth.

And they piss on failures made in the pursuit of truth, to tell you lies, when they do not actually try to know what is mathematically correct—preferring only to rely on what they can convince you is correct.

I fail. And I cheer my ability to not only fail in trying, but to admit that I fail, and I fail, and I fail.

And through failing honestly, I find success, honestly.

Can you name a single mathematical success you've ever had?

Re: JSH: Newsgroups mistakes, updated explanation and proof

While the demons tell you lies.

There are no lies, James. We are telling you the truth.

.