

Re: Towards a Formula for Primes

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-05/msg01557.html>

- *From:* Douglas Eagleson <eaglesondouglas@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 9 May 2007 07:34:30 -0700
-

On May 9, 10:30 am, Pubkeybreaker <pubkeybrea...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

Douglas Eagleson wrote:

<snip>

A fraction as ratio was the $c^2=a^2+b^2$ equation and the next was the question, how to not just test, but count a list of primes.

So the test is commonly taken to the limit of conception and given an algebraic ring representation. And then called a counting. I am not a mathematician, but just warn of the level of trial you seek.

Step one is to stay geometric. Forsake mathematics. Always call the number a point reference. A second class of reader is then required. A geometry expert.

This rambling collection of words pasted together isn't even English, let alone mathematics. It is a word salad; devoid of any information content.

Can someone else make sense of the gibberish that was written? I certainly can't.

<snip>

Geometry is speed limited by the ratio factor solution for it has no commutivity property.

Re: Towards a Formula for Primes

Wubba wubba wubba More word salad; grab words at random and paste them together.... The result has no meaning whatsoever.

Well, the test was to be a normal open thinker. And if you complain of giberish the reality is gone from your area of interest. A collection of words is to be examined using all thinking not jackass predicate. So go home and complain on a different newsgroup.

Who gives a crap about your kind thinking correctly.

.