

# Re: About random, primes and statistics

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-08/msg03319.html>

---

- *From:* William Hughes <[wpihughes@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:wpihughes@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 20 Aug 2007 18:28:02 -0700
- 

On Aug 20, 9:14 pm, JSH <[jst...@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jst...@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Aug 20, 6:04 pm, Eric Gisse <[jowr...@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jowr...@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Aug 20, 4:31 pm, JSH <[jst...@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jst...@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

[...]

Your delusions are off-topic for sci.physics. GTFO.

Actually the subject of random is very important in physics, and it turns out that it's a good exercise to play with statistical tools and  $p \bmod 3$ , so I'm on topic.

You are not.

I like this route because  $p \bmod 3$  is so short while it can take a while to plug everything in, and better yet, watch the math people start jumping around and acting like crazed freaks when you challenge them with the results.

I figure, they'll try to talk rational at first, then get increasingly defensive and then turn to insults, finishing up with claiming that physics people just don't know math.

And they'll try to walk away at that point and not face any consequences, I'd guess.

James Harris

Re: About random, primes and statistics

I predict you will ignore simple demonstrations that the sequence is not random, and demand instead that people explain to you why it is not random.

– William Hughes

.