

Re: JSH: Your funeral

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-09/msg03435.html>

- *From:* JSH <jstevh@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 16 Sep 2007 15:44:31 -0000
-

On Sep 16, 8:03 am, Jim Burns <burns...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

Rupert wrote:

On Sep 11, 10:23 am, JSH <jst...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

[...]

The question is, do I have the potential?

If you know that I don't then why worry?

But if you know that I do then make no mistake, the warnings are nearly over and when I'm done I'll make certain that no one ever tries what you people did, again.

James Harris

What exactly is your problem with our behaviour?

You post attempted solutions to the factoring problem. We point out that they don't work. You later agree that they don't work. What's the big deal? Why are we responsible for your problems?

I fear that James has discovered The Secret: that his attempts

Re: JSH: Your funeral

at a factoring algorithm (or a short proof of FLT, and so on) have failed BECAUSE sci.math didn't accept it.

I'm only partly kidding here. Judging by the small percentage of his posts that I've read over the years, James seems to be infected by a particularly virulent form of social constructivism, wherein truths are true only BECAUSE of the social consensus that claims they are true.

No that is the rule that modern mathematicians use.

See: http://www.maa.org/devlin/devlin_06_03.html

That links to an article from a leading mathematicians that a mathematical argument is a proof when professional mathematicians say it is.

That is why "pure math" is so dangerous!

Applied mathematics can be tested in the real world to see if it has real value.

While so-called pure math is just about people's professional opinion.

James Harris

.