

Re: ** says: Definition: $\sum\{i \text{ in } \mathbb{N}\} i = 0$

Re: ** says: Definition: $\sum\{i \text{ in } \mathbb{N}\} i = 0$

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-06/msg04312.html>

- *From:* Franziska Neugebauer <Franziska-Neugebauer@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 23 Jun 2007 18:33:49 +0200
-

WM wrote:

On 23 Jun., 16:41, Franziska Neugebauer <Franziska-Neugeba...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

WM wrote:

On 23 Jun., 13:13, Franziska Neugebauer <Franziska-Neugeba...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

WM wrote:

We orthodox
mathematicians [...]

Who?

Not those which you erroneously consider to be. But there
are more
of us than you might expect.

But certainly not enough to outvote the authorities of orthox
mathematics.

Mathematics is not a matter of votes and definitions.

The body of orthodox mathematics is exactly that what the authorities
of orthodox mathematics by their genuine power of being authorities
decide to. Hence if you want to know what orthodox mathematics entails
you must ask them.

Re: ** says: Definition: $\sum\{i \text{ in } \mathbb{N}\} i = 0$

Re: ** says: Definition: $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} i = 0$

If you think that a certain parts of orthodox mathematics shall not or no longer be part of orthodox mathematics you shall discuss that with these authorities directly.

" $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1/2^n$ is not larger than 1." This theorem holds not by vote and not by definition, but by mathematics.

In contrast to the kind of voodoo performed in the general science institute the authorities of orthodox mathematics even know why $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}} i = 1$. And they even know that without any need for the third eye of yours.

F. N.

—

xyz

.